

THE VENETIAN TEXT (COD. MARC. LAT. XIV,
115) OF DANTE'S LETTER TO THE EMPEROR
HENRY VII.

§ I.

THE Latin text of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII) has been preserved in three MSS., two of the fourteenth century (*Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729, in the Vatican; and *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome), and one of the fifteenth (*Cod. Marciano Latino* XIV, 115, in the Biblioteca Marciana at Venice). The Vatican and S. Pantaleo texts have been transcribed in two previous articles in this *Review* (Vol. VII, pp. 1—39, 208—24). I now subjoin a transcript of the third, the Venetian MS., thus completing the series, whereby the whole of the MS. evidence for the Latin text of this and eight other letters is now for the first time made accessible to the student of Dante.

This MS., a brief account of which was given in a previous article¹, appears to have been executed at Siena, between 1481 and 1500². The Latin text of Dante's letter to Henry VII was first printed from this MS. by Karl Witte in his *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* VI, pp. 30—46), privately printed at Padua in 1827. As the collations of the various printed texts of this letter have already been given in the article referred to above³, it is not proposed to repeat them on the present occasion. An exception, however, is made in the case of Witte's text, which he claims to have printed direct from the Venetian MS.; but the collation will show that, though he professed to register in his *apparatus criticus* his departures from the reading of the MS., in not a few important passages he has introduced emendations *sub silentio*, while in others he has misread the MS. and registered readings which are non-existent.

¹ *M. L. R.* Vol. VII, p. 4, n. 7.

² See P. Wagner, *Die Echtheit der drei Kaiserbriefe Dantes im Lichte der Kritik* (Köln, 1906), p. 9.

³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 4—12.

As in the former transcripts, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The punctuation of the MS., such as it is, has been preserved. The folios of the MS. [8^{ro}—11^{ro}] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference, as before, the text of the letter has been broken up into sections, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of those in the Oxford Dante; and the colophon, which is written continuously with the text in the MS., has been detached and printed as a separate paragraph.

§ II.

In the MS.¹ the title of the letter, consisting of six lines and two words, begins at the top of fol. 8^{ro}. The text of the letter begins at l. 8, and ends in the middle of l. 11 of fol. 11^{ro}, the colophon, which consists of two lines and a half, ending at l. 13, in the middle of the folio, the remainder of which is occupied by another text.

In the *apparatus criticus*, Vat. indicates the Vatican MS.; Pant. the S. Pantaleo MS.; Ven. the Venetian MS.; and W. the *editio princeps* of the text as printed by Witte in the above-mentioned volume in 1827.

Sanctissimo Triumphatori² et domino (2) singulari Domino Henrico³ diuina prouiden-(3)-tia Romanorum rege⁴ semper⁵ augusto deuotissimi (4)-mi sui Dantes Aldigherri⁶ florentinus (5) et exul immeritus ac uniuersaliter omnes (6) Thusci⁷ qui pacem desiderant terre obscurum (7) ante pedes⁸.

[§ 1.] (8) Immensa dei dilectione testante relicta nobis est⁹ (9) pacis hereditas: ut in sua mira dulcedine mili-(10)-tie nostre dura¹⁰ mitercerent et in usu eius patrię (11) triumphis¹¹ gaudia mereremur. At liuor anti-(12)-qui et implacabilis hostis. humane prosperita-(13)-ti semper et conlatenter¹² insidians: non nullos (14) exheredando uolentes

¹ I am in possession of a photographic reproduction of the folios of the MS. containing Dante's letter, for the execution of which I am indebted to the kind offices of Mr Horatio F. Brown.

² Pant. *Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo T.*; in Vat. the title is wanting.

³ Pant. *Henricho*.

⁴ Pant. W.* *Regi*.

⁵ Pant. *et semper*.

⁶ Sic; Pant. *alagherii*; W.* *Alligherius*.

⁷ Pant. W.* *Tusci*.

⁸ W.* *osculantur pedes*.

⁹ Vat. *est nobis*.

¹⁰ W.* *durae*.

¹¹ Vat. Pant. W. *triumphantis*.

¹² Vat. *latanter*; Pant. W. *latenter*; W. erroneously gives *colatenter* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

ob tutoris absentiam nos¹ (15) alios impie² denudauit³ inuitos. Hinc diu sem-(16)-per⁴ flumina confusionis defleuimus et patrocini-(17)-nia iusti regis incessanter⁵ implorauimus⁶: et⁷ (18) qui satellitium saeui Tyranni disperderet et nos (19) in nostra iusticia reformaret. Cumque tu Cae-(20)-saris et Augusti subcessor Apennini iuga (21) transiliens ueneranda signa turpia⁸ retulisti (22) Protinus longa substituerunt suspiria la-(23)-chrymarumque diluuie⁹ desierunt et ceu¹⁰ Tytan (24) precipitatus¹¹ exoriens noua spes latio seculi (25) melioris effulxit. Tunc plerique uota sua (26) preuenientes in iubilo. tam saturnia regna quam (fol. 8^{vo}) uirginem redeuntem cum Marone cantabant.

[§ 2.] (2) Verum quia sol noster. siue desiderij fer-(3)-uor hoc submoueat¹² siue facies ueritatis: (4) aut morari jam¹³ Creditur¹⁴ aut retrocedere (5) supputatur¹⁵. quasi Iosue denuo uel amos (6) filius imperaret: incertitudine¹⁶ dubitare com-(7)-pellimur: et in uocem precursoris irrumpere¹⁷. (8) Sic tu es qui uenturus es. an alium expectamus. Et quamuis longa sitis in dubium que (10) sunt certa propter esse propinqua ut assolet (11) furibunda deflectat. Nihilominus in te cre-(12)-dimus et speramus: asseuerantes te dei¹⁸ mini-(13)-strum: et ecclesie filium: et romane glorie (14) promotorem. Nam et ego qui scribo tam (15) pro me quam pro aliis uel¹⁹ decet imperatoriam (16) maiestatem: benignissimum uidi et clemen-(17)-tissimum te audiui. Cum pedes tuos manus (18) mee²⁰ tractarunt. et labia mea debitum per-(19)-soluerunt: cum²¹ exultauit in me spiritus meus. (20) Cum tacitus dixi mecum Ecce agnus dei (21) ecce qui tollit²² peccata mundi.

[§ 3.] Sed quid tam (22) sera moretur segnitie admiramur. quando (23)-do iam dudum²³ in ualle uictor Heridani²⁴ non (24) secus²⁵ tusciam derelinquis²⁶: pretermictis. et negli-(25)-gis quam si²⁷ iura²⁸ tuendi²⁹ imperij

¹ Vat. non.

³ Pant. denudare.

⁵ Vat. incensanter.

⁷ Vat. Pant. W. omit et.

⁹ Vat. Pant. W.* diluuia.

¹⁰ W. quasi; he erroneously gives cum in his apparatus criticus as the reading of Ven.

¹¹ Vat. Pant. preoptatus.

¹² Vat. summoueât; Pant. summoeneat; W. submoneat.

¹³ W. inserts te before jam.

¹⁵ W.* supputant.

¹⁷ W. erumpere.

¹⁹ Vat. Pant. uelut; W. ut.

²¹ Vat. tunc.

²³ Pant. omits dudum.

²⁴ Pant. victor in ualle victor Heridianj.

²⁶ W.* derelinquens.

²⁸ Pant. vita.

² Vat. impios.

⁴ Vat. Pant. W. super.

⁶ Vat. Pant. implorabamus.

⁸ Vat. Pant. W.* tarpeia.

¹⁴ W.* credunt.

¹⁶ Vat. in certitudine.

¹⁸ Vat. omits dei.

²⁰ Pant. (apparently) uitas.

²² Pant. tollis.

²⁵ W.* omits non secus.

²⁷ W.* quasi.

²⁹ Vat. Pant. tutanda.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made sub silentio.

circumscribi Li-(26)-gurum¹ finibus arbitreris. Non prorsus ut (fol. 9^{ro}) suspicamur aduertens² quoniam Romanorum (2) gloriosa³ potestas nec metis italie: nec iriconis⁴ (3) Europe margine cohartatur⁵. Nam et si uim (4) passa in⁶ Augustum⁷ gubernacula sua contraxit⁸: (5) undique tamen de inuiolabili Iure fluctus. Am-(6)-phitricis⁹ attingens¹⁰ uix ab inutili unda ocea-(7)-ni se circumcingi dignatur Scriptum est enim¹¹ nasce-(8)-tur. pulchra Troyanus origine Caesar. Impe-(9)-rium¹² oceano famam qui terminet astris. Et (10) Cum vniuersaliter orbem describi edixisset (11) Augustus vt bos noster euangelizans accen-(12)-sus ignis flamma¹³ remugit¹⁴. Si non de Iustissimi (13) principatus aula prodijisset¹⁵ edictum. unige-(14)-nitus dei filius homo factus qui¹⁶ ad proficen-(15)-dum¹⁷ secundum naturam assumptam edicit¹⁸ se (16) subditum. Nequaquam tunc¹⁹ nasci de uirgine uo-(17)-luisset. Non enim suasisset iniustum²⁰ qui²¹ om-(18)-nem iusticiam implere debebat²².

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaque (19) in angusta²³ mundi area metiri²⁴ tam diu quem (20) mundus omnis expectat et ab augusta²⁵ circum-(21)-spectione non defluat quod tuscana²⁶ Tyrannis in (22) dilationis fiducia confortatur. ut²⁷ cotidie ma-(23)-lingnantium cohartando²⁸ superbiam uires nouas (24) accumulatur temeritatem temeritati adiciens. In-(25)-tonet igitur²⁹ uos³⁰ illa Curionis In Caesarem. Dum (26) trepidant nullo firmari³¹ robore partes. Tolle (fol. 9^{vo}) moras nocuit semper³² differre paratis. Par la-(2)-bor atque metas³³ precio maiore petuntur. Into-(3)-net illa uox increpitantis Annubis³⁴ in³⁵ Eneam. (4) Si te nulla mouet tantarum

¹ Pant. (apparently) *ligineranj*; W.* *Liguriae*.

² Pant. *aduerteris*.

³ W.* omits *gloriosa*.

⁴ Vat. Pant. W.* *tricornis*.

⁵ W. reads *coartatur*, and erroneously gives *cohartant* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

⁶ Vat. *non*.

⁷ W. *angustum*.

⁸ Vat. Pant. *contraxerit*.

⁹ Vat. *amphitritis*; Pant. *amphytretis*; W.* *Amphitrites*.

¹⁰ Vat. *attigens*.

¹¹ Vat. *scriptum etenim uobis est*; Pant. *Scriptum et enim nobis est*.

¹² Pant. *Imperij*.

¹³ Vat. Pant. *ignis eterni flamma*.

¹⁴ Pant. *remigit*.

¹⁵ Pant. *prodisset*.

¹⁶ Vat. Pant. W. omit *qui*.

¹⁷ Vat. Pant. W. *profitendum*.

¹⁸ Vat. Pant. W. *edicto*.

¹⁹ W.* *tum*.

²⁰ Pant. *in iustum*.

²¹ Vat. Pant. *quem*.

²² Vat. Pant. *decebat*.

²³ Vat. Pant. *angustissima*.

²⁴ Vat. Pant. W. *irretiri*.

²⁵ Vat. Pant. *augusti*.

²⁶ Pant. *Tuscana*.

²⁷ Vat. Pant. W. *et*.

²⁸ Vat. W.* *cohortando*; Pant. *coartando*.

²⁹ Vat. Pant. *iterum*.

³⁰ Vat. Pant. W.* *vox*.

³¹ Vat. *firmate*; Pant. (apparently) *firmitate*; W.* *firmitate*.

³² Vat. Pant. W.* *semper nocuit*.

³³ Vat. Pant. W.* *metus*.

³⁴ Vat. *a nubis*; Pant. W.* *a nubibus*.

³⁵ Vat. Pant. *iterum in*.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

gloria rerum. Nec (5) super ipse tua moliris¹ laude laborem Ascanium (6) surgentem et spes heredis Iuli² respice cui Re-(7)-gnum³ italie Romanaque regna⁴ debentur⁵.

[§ 5.] Io-(8)-hannes namque regius primogenitus tuus et (9) Rex: quem post diei orientis occasum mun-(10)-di subcessiua prosteritas⁶ pretoletur⁷ Nobis (11) est alter. Ascanius⁸ qui uestigia⁹ magni geni-(12)-toris obseruans in Turnos ubique sicut Leo de-(13)-seuiet et in latino¹⁰ uelut agnus¹¹ mitescet (14) precaueant sacratissimi Regis alta consi-(15)-lia: ne coeleste iudicium Samuelis illa uerba (16) reasperet: Nonne cum paruulus esses¹² in¹³ oculis (17) tuis caput in tribus¹⁴ Ysrael factus es. unxit-(18)-que deus¹⁵ in regem¹⁶: et misit te deus¹⁷ in uiam¹⁸: et ait (19) uade et interfice peccatores Amalech. Nam (20) et tu in regem sacratus es. ut Amalech percutias¹⁹: (21) et²⁰ Agagi²¹ parcas minime²²: atque ulciscaris illum (22) qui misit te de gente in gentem brath bratali²³: et (23) de festina sua solemnitate que quidem et Ame-(24)-lech et Agagi²⁴ sonare dicuntur²⁵.

[§ 6.] tu Mediolani (25) tam uernando quam hyemando moraris et Hydram²⁶ (26) pestiferam per Caputum amputationem reris²⁷ extinguere (fol. 10^{ro}) quod si²⁸ magnalia gloriose²⁹ alcide³⁰ recensuisses. te (2) ut illum falli cognosceris³¹ cui pestilens animal (3) capite repopulare³² multiplici per damnum cresce-(4)-bat donec instanter³³ magnanimis³⁴ uite principium (5) Impetiuit³⁵. Non enim³⁶ ad arbores extirpandas³⁷

¹ Vat. *molitis*.

³ Vat. *regimen*.

⁵ Pant. adds *etcetera*.

⁶ Vat. Pant. W.* *posteritas*; in MS. *prosteritas* has been altered from *prosperitas*.

⁷ Vat. Pant. W.* *prestolatur*.

⁹ Pant. *vestigiam*.

¹¹ Vat. *agnos*.

¹³ W.* omits *in*.

¹⁵ Vat. Pant. *unxit que te dominus*; W.* *unxitque Dominus*.

¹⁶ Vat. *in Regem super israel*.

¹⁸ Vat. W.* *in via*.

²⁰ Vat. *ut*; Pant. omits.

²² Vat. Pant. *non parcas*.

²⁴ Vat. Pant. *Agag*.

²⁵ W. omits *que quidem et A. et A. sonare dicuntur*, and erroneously gives *sanare* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

²⁶ Vat. Pant. *ydram*.

²⁸ Vat. *quia si*.

³⁰ W.* *Alcides*.

³² Vat. Pant. *repullulante*; W. *repullulans*.

³⁴ Vat. Pant. W.* *magnanimus*; the form *magnanimis*, however, was current in the Middle Ages; it is registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*: "*Magnanimus, ma, mum, ...et hic et hec magnanimis et hoc me* in eodem sensu, idest audax, fortis."

³⁵ W. *amputauit*; he erroneously gives *impertivit* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

³⁶ Vat. Pant. *non etenim*.

² Pant. *Iulij*.

⁴ Pant. *tellus*.

⁸ Pant. *aschanus*.

¹⁰ Vat. Pant. W.* *Latinos*.

¹² Vat. *esset*.

¹⁴ Vat. Pant. W.* *tribubus*.

¹⁷ Pant. *dominus*.

¹⁹ Vat. *percuciens*.

²¹ Vat. Pant. *Agag*.

²³ Vat. Pant. W.* *de gente bratali*.

²⁷ Pant. *veris*.

²⁹ Vat. *gloriosi*; W.* *gloriosa*.

³¹ Vat. Pant. W.* *cognoscere*.

³³ W.* omits *instante*.

³⁷ Pant. *extirpendas*.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

(6) ualet ipsa Romanorum¹ incisio. quin² iterum mul-(7)-tiplicius uia terre³ ramescent⁴: quousque radi-(8)-ces incolumes fuerint ut prebeant alimentum (9) qui prees⁵ unice mundi⁶ peregisse⁷ preconiiis⁸. Cum cer-(10)-uicem Cremonę deflexeris contumacis. Non-(11)-ne ut tuo⁹ vel tu¹⁰ brixie uel papie rabies ino-(12)-pina turgescet. Ymo que cum etiam¹¹ flagellum¹² rese-(13)-derit: Mox alia uerzellis: uel pergami uel (14) alibi returgebit¹³ donec huiusmodi rabies tollatur¹⁴ (15) radice¹⁵ tanti erroris auulsa. Cum trunco rami (16) pugitiui¹⁶ arescant.

[§ 7.] An ignoras excellentis-(17)-sime¹⁷ principium¹⁸: nec de speculo¹⁹ summe celsitudinis (18) deprehendis ubi vulpecula foetoris istius ve-(19)-nantium secura recumbat²⁰ Quippe nec pado (20) precipiti nec Tyberi tuo criminoſa potant²¹ ve-(21)-rum Sarni fluenta torrentis adhuc rictus eius²² (22) Inficiunt et Florentiam²³ forte nescis dyra (23) hec pernities nuncupatur. Hec est vipera uersa in (24) uiscera genitricis. Hec languida²⁴ pecus. que²⁵ (25) gregem domini sui sua contagione commaculat²⁶ (26) Hec Myrrha scoelestis et impia in Cinere posita²⁷ (fol. 10^{vo}) amplexus exestuans. Hec amata illa impa-(2)-tiens que repulso fatali connubio: quem semper²⁸ ne-(3)-gabant generum²⁹ sibi ascire non timuit sed furia-(4)-liter in bella³⁰ uocauit³¹ et demum male ausa (5) dum³² contra Romam cornua rebellionis exa-(6)-cuit que ad

¹ Vat. Pant. W.* *ramorum*.

³ Vat. *uirulenter*; Pant. *virulente*.

⁵ Vat. Pant. *quid preses*.

⁷ W. *quid peregisſe*.

⁸ Vat. *preconicis*; Pant. *preconijcis*; W. *praeconiaheris*.

⁹ Vat. Pant. W. *nonne tunc*.

¹¹ W. omits *etiam*, and erroneously gives *et* as the reading of Ven.

¹² Vat. Pant. *flagellata*.

¹⁴ Vat. Pant. *donec huiusmodi* (Vat. *huius*) *scatescentie causa radicalis tollatur*.

¹⁵ Vat. W. *et radice*; Pant. *et radix*.

¹⁶ Vat. Pant. *pungitiuj*; W. *pungentes*; he erroneously gives *pugitiens* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

¹⁷ Vat. *excellentissimę*.

¹⁹ Vat. Pant. W.* *specula*.

²¹ Vat. Pant. *potatur*; W.* *potat*.

²² Pant. *ritus eius*; W. *vitia sua*; he erroneously gives *victus es* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

²³ Vat. Pant. W. *Florentia*.

²⁵ Vat. omits *que*.

²⁷ Vat. *in Cinare patris*; Pant. *in amore patris*; W. *in Cinyrae patris*; he erroneously gives *Ciner* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

²⁸ Vat. Pant. *quem fata*; W. *quem sortes*; he erroneously gives *quae semper* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

²⁹ W. erroneously gives *generem* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

³⁰ Vat. *in bella furialiter*; W. *furialiter in bellum*; he erroneously gives *bello* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

³¹ Vat. *prouocauit*.

³² Vat. Pant. *male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit. vere matrem uiperea feritate*

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

ymaginem suam atque similitudinem (7) fecit illam. Uere fumo euaporantes¹ sanie ui-(8)-tiantes exalat et inde uicini² pecudes et ui-(9)-scie³ contabescunt dum falsis aliciendo⁴ blanditiis (10) et figmentis aggregat sibi finitimos et insi-(11)-nuat⁵ agregatos. uere in paternos ipsa concu-(12)-bitus⁶ dum improba procacitate⁷ conatur sum-(13)-mum pontificem⁸ qui pater est patrum aduersum⁹ (14) te uiolare assensum¹⁰ uere dei ordinationi¹¹ (15) restitit¹² proprię uoluntati¹³ ydolum uerenando¹⁴ (16) dum regem¹⁵ aspernata legiptimum¹⁶ non erube-(17)-scit insana regi non suo iura non sua pro (18) male agende¹⁷ potestate pacisci. Sed accen-(19)-dit¹⁸ ad laqueum mulier furiata quo se in-(20)-nectit. Nam sepe quis in reprobum sensum (21) traditur vt traditus faciat ea que etiam¹⁹ (22) conueniunt²⁰: que²¹ quamuis iniusta²² sint (23) opera iusta tamen suplicia esse noscuntur (24).

[§ 8.] Eia itaque rumpe moras proles alta²³ ysai (25) sume tibi fiduciam de oculis domini dei sa-(26)-baoth: coram quo agis: et Goliam hunc in (fol. 11^{ro}) funda sapientię sue²⁴: atque²⁵ in lapide²⁶ uirium (2) tuarum prosterne: quoniam in eius occasu (3) nos²⁷ et umbra timoris castra phylistino-(4)-rum²⁸ operiet. fugient philistei²⁹ et liberabitur (5) Israel tunc hereditas nostra quam sine inter-(6)-missione deflemus ablatam nobis erit in (7) integrum restituta. At quidem admodum³⁰ (8) sacrosancte Yerusalem memores exules (9) in babilone gemescimus. Ita tunc

dilaniare contendit dum; W. male ausa, [debitumque solvens, laqueo se suspendit.—Vere viperina feritate matrem lacerare ausa] dum. I erroneously in my first article (*M. L. R.* vii, 10 n. 4) spoke of a 'hiatus' in the MS. here between *ausa* and *dum contra*. There is no hiatus, in the sense of a gap, in the writing, which is continuous, but ten words (apparently representing two lines) have been omitted by the carelessness of the scribe.

¹ Vat. Pant. W. *fumos evaporante*.

² Vat. Pant. *uicine*.

³ Sic; Vat. Pant. *inscie*; W. *exterae*.

⁴ Vat. Pant. *illiciendo*.

⁵ Vat. *infatuat*; Pant. *infatuant*; W. *insanescit*.

⁶ Vat. Pant. *in paternis ardet ipsa concubitus*; W. *in p. incensa c.*

⁷ Pant. *pro capacitate*.

⁸ Vat. Pant. W. *summi pontificis*.

⁹ W.* *aduersus*.

¹⁰ Vat. *ascensum*.

¹¹ Corrected from *ordinationis*.

¹² Vat. Pant. W. *resistit*.

¹³ Vat. Pant. W. *voluntatis*.

¹⁴ Sic, for *uenerando*.

¹⁵ Pant. *regem suum*.

¹⁶ Vat. *legiptimum*.

¹⁷ Vat. *agendu*; Pant. W.* *agendi*.

¹⁸ Vat. Pant. *atendat*; W. *attendit*.

¹⁹ Vat. Pant. W.* *non*.

²⁰ W. erroneously gives *convenienti* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

²¹ W.* omits *que*.

²² Vat. *iusta*; Pant. *in iusta*.

²³ Vat. Pant. *altera*.

²⁴ Vat. Pant. *tue*; W. *tuae*.

²⁵ Pant. *at*.

²⁶ Pant. *lapidem*.

²⁷ Vat. W. *nox*; Pant. *vox*; in his *apparatus criticus* W. erroneously gives *mos* as the reading of Ven.

²⁸ Vat. Pant. *filistinorum*; W.* *Philisteorum*.

²⁹ Vat. *filistej*; Pant. *filistey*.

³⁰ Vat. *At quem admodum*; Pant. *At quemadmodum*; W. *At quidem, ad modum quo nunc*.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

ciues et re-(10)-spirantes in pace¹ confusionis miserius² in gau-(11)-dio reuelemur³.

Scriptum in Tuscia sub fon-(12)-te⁴ sarni xv^{o5} Kalendas Maias. diui Henrici fa-(13)-ustissimi⁶ cursus ad Italiam anno primo⁷.

I propose at a future date to print, either in this *Review* or elsewhere, a critical text, based on my collations of the MSS. and printed editions, of the nine letters attributed to Dante (viz. *Epistolae* I, II, III, V, VI, VII, and the three so-called Battifolle letters) contained in the Vatican, S. Pantaleo, and Venetian MSS., which have formed the subject of this and the two previous articles.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

¹ W. erroneously gives *pacem* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

² Vat. Pant. W.* *miserias*.

³ Vat. Pant. *recolemus*; W. *revolvemus*.

⁴ W.* *fontem*.

⁵ Pant. *XV^a*; W.* *XI*.

⁶ Pant. *diuj faustissimj Herrij*.

⁷ Vat. omits the colophon.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

LES NOMS ROMANS DE L' OBLATA MELANURUS, CUV.

L'*Oblata melanurus* Cuv. est un poisson qui abonde dans la Méditerranée. Ses marques caractéristiques sont : de gros yeux noirs, une grosse tache noirâtre des deux côtés de la queue, des stries noires sur le dos, enfin la couleur argentée des côtés et du ventre. De là la plupart de ses noms populaires.

Pour ses grands yeux noirs on lui a donné le nom d'*oculata* (Celsius, Pline), d'où le sarde *ojada* (Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 636 écrit *occhiata*, forme italienne normale), gènois *éuggià* (Casaccia), napol. *occhiata*, à Catane *ucchiata*, à Venise *ochià*, *ochiada* ; on peut aussi comparer les noms italiens *occhiata*, *occhione*, *occhialone* par lesquels Paoletti traduit le vénitien *ochià* ; *occhi nera* à Naples (Carus, *op. cit.*) ; enfin, dans Rondelet, *De Pisc. Marin.* (éd. 1554, p. 126), le *nigr'oïl* cité comme de Montpellier (cf. Mistral qui donne *negre-uei*, *negre olh* et *nigrol*), et qui, passant dans les grands dictionnaires français, s'y est fait une place jusque dans Littré (le *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, éd. 1771, donne par exemple, *nigroïl*, et aussi *négoeil*, *negre*, comme nom du poisson ; on trouve aussi *nigrois* dans le Raymond de 1832 et *négroeil* dans Cotgrave).

La grosse tache de la queue a valu au poisson ses noms en néo-grec : *μελανούρι* en Grèce, *μελανούριον* dans les Cyclades (Carus, *op. cit.*). Rondelet (*op. cit.*), en lui donnant le nom de *melanurus*, l'a identifié avec le *melanurus* de Pline ; *melanurus* a fini par servir de nom spécifique du poisson dans la nomenclature de Cuvier.

Le nom générique *oblata* est fait sur le français *oblade* qui, en définitive, remonte à *oblado*, donné comme marseillais par Rondelet, *De Piscibus Marinis*, ed. 1554, p. 126. On a supposé qu'il s'agissait d'*oblata* 'oublie' (voir Mistral à *oublado*) et il semble qu'il faut tenir compte de cette hypothèse devant l'esp. et catal. *oblada*, le prov. *oublado* et le sarde *orbada*, bien que la raison de cette transference de sens soit loin d'être claire pour moi. D'autre part, de nombreuses formes usitées

sur les bords de la Méditerranée me font songer à **albulata*, dû aux couleurs argentées des côtés et du ventre, **nebulata* dû au dos strié de noir, de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv.

On remarquera d'abord que ce poisson s'appelle *albero bastardo* à Venise (Paoletti, etc.); or *albero* est une variante d'*alboro*, *arboro*, noms à Venise du *pagellus erythrinus* Cuv. C'est un dérivé d'*albulus* sur lequel j'ai dit quelques mots dans la *Rev. de Philol. Franç.*, XXI, 241 et dans la *Rev. des Langues Romanes*, LI, 384; j'ai surtout fait observer que, pour les dérivés romans, il fallait tenir compte d'**abulus*, -a (avec dissimilation du premier l) aussi bien que d'*albulus*, -a. Parmi les noms de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., le prov. *aoblado* cité par Azaïs représente parfaitement **albulata*; comme *aoblado* est pour un plus ancien *aublada*¹, peut-être serait-ce par aphérèse de l'a, confondu avec la voyelle de l'article féminin, qu'on aurait *ublada*, attesté dans un règlement de 1433 sur la vente du poisson, tiré des archives de Toulon par M. P. Meyer, *Docum. Linguist. du Midi de la France*, p. 627 note (cf. Marseille *ublado*).

Quoi qu'il en soit de ce dernier point, ce n'est ni *oblata*, ni **albulata*, mais seulement **abulata* qui expliquera, me semble-t-il, la genèse de la série suivante de noms de notre poisson: Marseille *blado*, Var *blado*, Nice *blada*, Messine *biata* (on doit le confondre avec le féminin de l'adj. *biatu*, *beatu*; cf. à Valencia en Espagne *beata* = *oblata melanurus* Cuv. d'après Cisternas cité par Carus, *op. cit.*), Naples *jata* (qui est à *biata* comme *janco* à Naples est à l'it. *bianco*), *ajata* (avec agglutination partielle de l'article féminin).

De **nebulata* le prov. *neblado*² = *oblata melanurus* Cuv. (cf. prov. *nieulo* 'oublie'). A côté de *neblada*, il y a eu *niblada* (cf. les formes citées par Mistral à *nive*) qui, par l'aphérèse d'n, senti comme faisant partie de l'article indéfini, a donné le niçois *iblada*. Le pluriel d'*iblada*, graphié *hibladas*, est attesté dans un règlement niçois sur la vente du poisson, de peu postérieur à 1445, et publié dans ses *Documents Linguistiques du Midi de la France* (p. 626) par M. P. Meyer³.

Après cette série de dérivés d'*oblata*, **albulata* (et **abulata*), **nebulata*, il faut encore noter à Valencia (Espagne) *doblada* (= ? *peix*

¹ On trouve *aublado* expliqué par l'*oblade* dans la liste des noms français d'animaux de Nemnich, *Polyglotten-Lexicon* (1793-8).

² A Cette *neblada* (Doumet d'après Carus, *op. cit.*).

³ M. Meyer, dans son glossaire, dit: '*hibladas* "vergadelle, poisson de mer"' (Mistral, *iblado*). L'art. *iblado* de Mistral ne vaut rien mais on y renvoie à *aublado* où se lit le véritable sens d'*iblado*. De même, dans Avril, *Dict. Prov.* (1839-40) *blado* est traduit par *vergadelle*. *Vergadelle* est un nom du *box salpa* Cuv.; cf. ma note 36 dans la *Rev. d. L. rom.*, II, 405.

d'*oblada*) et *virador*, ce dernier nom dû sans doute à des habitudes du poisson¹; enfin à Naples *fiata*².

Reste, des noms de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., l'esp. *chopa*. Il y a déjà longtemps, M. Meyer-Lübke a proposé de rattacher *chopa* au lat. *clupea* (*Z. für die österreichischen Gymn.*, 1891, p. 768), et dans son *Romanisches etym. Wörterbuch* (fasc. 2 et 3, publ. 1911) il reste du même avis. Voici l'article :

1998 *clupea* 'Alose' (ein Flussfisch), 2. *clipea*.

1. Astur. *chopia*, span. *chopa*, galiz. *jouba*, vgl. serb.-kroat *kobla*.

2. Venez., veron., trevis. *čepa*; ital. *cheppia* 'Wels.'

Pour 2, je remarque que Venise *chieppa*, *cheppia*, Fiume *ciepa*, Croatie *čepa*, *čipa* sont bien des dérivés de *clupea*, mais ce sont des noms du *clupea alosa* Cuv. (l'alse) qui n'est pas un poisson de rivière mais plutôt un poisson de mer qui remonte les rivières (cf. Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 552 pour les formes citées); ce n'est pas un nom du *silurus glanis* L. (all. *Wels*) qui n'est pas même mentionné dans le *Catalogo dei Pesci d'acqua dolce d'Italia* de Giovanni Canestrini. Pour ce qui est de la rubrique 1, l'astur. *chopia* m'est inconnu; Rato de Argüeller dans son *Vocabulario* (1891) ne donne que *chopa* avec la vague indication 'pez.' Le galic. *jouba*, nom de l'*engraulis encrasicholus* Cuv., ne peut être séparé des autres noms de ce poisson en Espagne, par ex. de l'esp. *anchova*. Reste l'esp. *chopa* auquel on peut ajouter le port. *choupa* que Michaelis dans son *Novo Dictionario* (7^e éd., 1905) traduit par l'all. *ringauge*, *brandbrassen*.

Que l'esp. *chopa* dérive du lat. *clupea*, c'est ce que ne permettent d'admettre ni la phonétique historique ni les sens attestés pour les deux mots. Je fais la remarque que *chopa* est dans les dictionnaires (p. ex. celui de l'Acad. Royale Espagnole) comme nom de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., mais qu'il se dit aussi en espagnol des poissons du genre *cantharus* Cuv., proches parents de ceux du genre *oblata* Cuv. et qui ont entre autres marques caractéristiques, celle, déjà notée chez l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., de gros yeux cerclés d'une espèce d'anneau. Je cite, d'après Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 626 les formes: esp. *chopa*, *chupa* = *cantharus lineatus* Thompson, esp. *sopa*, *jopa* = *cantharus orbicularis*

¹ J'ai déjà dit ailleurs que la zoologie reste très anatomique et ne s'occupe guère des habitudes des poissons.

² Les oblades se nourrissent d'algues et de limon comme le *stromateus fiatola* L. (cf. mes notes 99, 100, dans la *Rev. d. L. rom.* LIII, 34), ce qui leur donne un mauvais goût et une mauvaise odeur. J'ai expliqué *fiatola*, nom à Rome du *stromateus fiatola* L., par un **flatula*, forme féminine d'un adj. **flatulus* 'puant.' Si le napol. *fiata* doit s'expliquer par *fiata* fém. de l'adj. participial *flatus*, il faudra supposer que cet adjectif a eu le sens de 'puant.'

Cuv. L'examen de ces formes porte à croire que *sopa* est la forme première et que *jopa* est une forme qui a subi l'influence de l'arabe; cf. l'esp. *jurel* = *trachurus Linnaei* Malm. qui se rattache au lat. *saurus* (cf. Barcelone *sorell* = *trachurus Linnaei* Malm. et voir ma note 120 dans la *Rev. d. L. romanes*, LIII, 50).

Si *sopa* est la forme première, serait-ce le même mot que l'it. *soppa*, *suppa*, *zuppa*, piem. *supa*, prov. *soupo*, auv. *supo*, fr. *soupe*, catal. esp. galic. port. *sopa*, dont le sens de 'bouillon' est postérieur à celui de 'tranche de pain trempé dans le bouillon' et qui ne doit pas être séparé de l'it. *zuppo*, langued. *chop*, gasc. *chope*, catal. *xop* 'mouillé'? En Espagne, le sens 'chose mouillée' est attestée pour *sopa*; cf. *sopa de arroyo* 'caillou de rivière.' Il n'est pas impossible que l'esp. *chopa* qui se dit du 'petit logement pratiqué sur le haut de la poupe pour le timonnier' vienne du fait que ce logement était particulièrement exposé à être trempé par l'eau de la mer. Déjà, dans son *De Piscibus Marinis* (1554), Rondelet avait appelé l'attention sur l'extrême humidité de la chair de son *cantharus* (= *cantharus lineatus* Thompson): 'cantharus molli est nimium praehumidaque carne' (p. 122); il dit de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., son *melanurus*: 'carne est molli'; on peut donc croire qu'on a donné à ces poissons le nom de *sopa*, *jopa*, *chopa* (pour ce dernier cf. le langued. *chop* 'mouillé' cité plus haut) pour des raisons tirées de l'humidité extrême de leur chair. Pour la forme *chupa*, on a vu plus haut que les formes romanes alternent entre *o* et *u*.

PAUL BARBIER FILS.

LEEDS.

THE EARLIEST FRENCH APOCALYPSE AND COMMENTARY.

I.

MM. Delisle and Meyer, in their *L'Apocalypse en français au xiii^e Siècle*¹, have edited a typical version of the earliest French *Apocalypse* and Commentary, and the specimen they have selected is the manuscript Fr. 403, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, distinguished by them as 'MS. Charles V.' M. Meyer mentions as a remarkable fact that the origin of this once popular version has been lost in obscurity²; but though the actual source remains undiscovered, we can learn part of its history from a perusal of the work itself. The object of the present paper is to indicate the sources from which the substance of the commentary is derived and to fix the date of its composition. As to the Scriptural text, M. Meyer may be right in attributing it and the commentary to the same pen. The reason he gives is that where the commentary contains a citation from the *Apocalypse* that citation reproduces the text of the translation³. But the same result might be produced if the commentator made use of a previously existing translation of the text and, therefore, it may be that the text belongs to an earlier date than the commentary.

A fourteenth century translation of the French *Apocalypse* and Commentary into English was believed, down to the latter part of the last century, to be an original work of Wycliffe's, but, upon comparison, the identity of the translation with the older French work is placed beyond a doubt⁴. This translation is thought to be, with the possible

¹ Published by the Société des anciens textes français and hereafter cited as Delisle and Meyer.

² Delisle and Meyer, p. cexvii.

³ Delisle and Meyer, p. ccv.

⁴ Bale in the sixteenth century (*Scriptorum illustrium...Catalogus*, ch. vi, pp. 451, 453), Forshall and Madden in 1850 (*The Wycliffe Bible*, i, p. 8) and Shirley in 1865 (*Catalogue of the original works of John Wyclif*, p. 36), attributed this English version to Wycliffe. Arnold, in his *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, 1869-1871 (p. iv), proved by internal evidence that the commentary could not be Wycliffe's, and Miss A. C. Paves, in *A fourteenth century English version*, 1904 (p. xxvii), discovered that it was merely a translation from the French version.

exception of the Psalter, the earliest English translation after the Conquest of any of the books of the Bible¹. Apart from the English translation, the French version is of special interest to us from the number and beauty of the manuscripts known to have been executed in England²; and, beyond this, the commentary is illustrative of an important period in the history of the Church.

In M. Meyer's introduction to MS. Charles V he expresses a decided opinion that the French Commentary is derived from a Latin text now unknown to us in its complete form. An Apocalypse with a commentary belonging to the Osuna collection in the National Library of Madrid and the *Bible moralisée* are believed to represent the lost Latin text, but, if so, they reproduce it in an abridged form³.

Authorities are not agreed as to the date of the original work. M. Samuel Berger fixes upon the latter half of the twelfth century⁴. M. Delisle also suggests the twelfth century but his collaborateur, M. Meyer, thinks that the work belongs to the first half of the thirteenth century and is inclined to attribute it to the influence of the Franciscans and Dominicans and their efforts to re-establish the unity of the faith by an attack on the heretics and the reform of the clergy. On the whole M. Meyer thinks it would not be rash to conjecture that the commentary is the work of a Franciscan⁵. The manuscript edited by MM. Delisle and Meyer is the earliest now known to exist and M. Meyer dates it in the middle of the thirteenth century and thinks that the author was French, perhaps Norman⁶. M. Delisle gives the manuscript an Anglo-Norman origin and dates it at the commencement of the thirteenth century⁷. M. Berger gives the manuscript the same date as M. Delisle and the dialect as pure Norman⁸. Taking these authorities as a basis, we have a period extending from 1150 to 1250 to choose from in fixing the date of the original composition.

The complete work consists of prologue, scriptural text and commentary. The text is broken up into sections and each section is followed by its commentary. The prologue which contains about seven hundred words has an important bearing on the history of the work. In MS.

¹ Miss Paues, *ut supra*, ed. 1902, p. xxiii.

² See J. A. Herbert, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, ch. xii.

³ Delisle and Meyer, pp. ccxiv et seq.

⁴ *La Bible française au moyen âge*, pp. 81, 82, 88.

⁵ Delisle and Meyer, i, ii, cexvii—ccxix. The general opinion seems to be that the Franciscans were established first, but see Gregorovius, *Hist. of Rome in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Hamilton, vol. v, pt. i, p. 110. The Dominicans claimed to be earlier. See Mat. Paris, *Chron. Majora* (Rolls ed.) iv 279.

⁶ Delisle and Meyer, p. ccvi (note), p. ccvii.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. ii.

⁸ *La Bible française au moyen âge*, pp. 78, 79.

Charles V the prologue is wanting, but this is probably accidental¹. In all the other manuscripts of the same class there is a prologue beginning with the words: 'Seint Pol l'apostre dit ke tuz iccus ke voillent pient vivre en Jhesu Crist sufferunt persecution².' M. Berger tells us that this prologue is the work of the celebrated Bishop of Poitiers, Gilbert de la Porée, who died in 1154³. Upon this M. Meyer remarks that Berger has given no proof in support of his assertion and that he, M. Meyer, has not succeeded in verifying it⁴. Proof, however, is not wanting that the French version is an adaptation of Bishop Gilbert's prologue which will be found prefixed to the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* of Albertus Magnus⁵. The same prologue is prefixed to the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* of St Thomas Aquinas⁶. It is also prefixed to the *Postillæ* on the Apocalypse of Nicholas de Lyra⁷. In referring to this matter, the *Histoire littéraire de la France*⁸ mentions a commentary on the Apocalypse as one of the works of Gilbert de la Porée, of which 'la préface se trouve à la tête des Postilles de Nicolas de Lyra sur ce livre [l'Apocalypse], et le corps de l'ouvrage a été employé dans une compilation de différens interprètes anciens de l'Apocalypse publiée à Paris l'an 1512 en un volume en 8°.'

If a French version of Gilbert de la Porée's prologue has been chosen for an introduction to our Apocalypse, we might expect that his commentary would have an important bearing on the origin of the French commentary, but this result does not seem to follow. A compilation answering to the description of that referred to at the end of the last paragraph is entitled *Sermones super Apocalypsim*, and was published at Paris by Jehan Petit in 1512⁹. It contains a prologue based on that of Gilbert de la Porée with the addition of a full commentary on the prologue itself. The work purports to contain materials for sermons, especially for Advent and Lent, and to be founded on the commentaries of nine distinct authors, of whom one is Gilbertus, 'qui Augustinum quasi in omnibus imitatur.' Apparently this is all that is now known of Gilbert's commentary. The *Expositio in Apocalypsim* attributed to St Augustine of Hippo and constructed by his editors chiefly from the works of Victorinus, Primasius, and Beda, is contained

¹ Delisle and Meyer, pp. cclvii, cclviii.

² MM. Delisle and Meyer give the prologue at length from MS. Bibl. Nat. fr. 9574 (ed. cit. p. cclviii).

³ *La Bible française au moyen âge*, p. 88.

⁴ Delisle and Meyer, p. cclvii.

⁵ *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1899, vol. xxxviii.

⁶ *Divi Thomæ Aquinatis in Beati Joannis Apocalypsim Expositio*, Florentiæ, 1549.

⁷ Brit. Mus. i. B. 3064.

Tome xii, 473.

⁹ Bodleian, Th. 8°. A. 62.

in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*¹, and bears little resemblance to the French Commentary, for the foundations of which we must look elsewhere.

A peculiar feature of Gilbert's prologue is that it comprises, at the end, a short summary of the first eight verses of Chapter I of the Apocalypse (if we may for this purpose adopt the later arrangement of chapter and verse). In the French version this summary is somewhat extended and in all the French manuscripts to which Gilbert's prologue is prefixed the Scriptural text and Commentary begin at verse 9². The last few lines of Gilbert's prologue are here placed side by side with the corresponding portion of the French version:

GILBERT DE LA PORÉE.

Modus tractandi talis est: primo præmittit Prologum et salutationem, ubi reddit auditores benignos et attentos: quo præmisso accedit ad narrationem. Ante narrationem vero ostendit Christum esse ab æterno sine principio et sine fine, inducens ipsum loquentem: *Ego sum Alpha et Omega*, id est, *principium et finis*. Postea accedens ad narrationem, distinguit septem visiones: quibus terminatis iste liber consummatur.

Præmittit autem Prologum, dicens: *Apocalypsis Jesu Christi*, subaudi, hæc est: sicut in aliis, *Visio Isaie hæc est: et Parabolæ Salomonis hæc sunt*.

Apocalypsis Jesu Christi quam dedit illi Deus palam facere servis suis, &c. (Chap. i, verse 1).

FRENCH VERSION.

(*MS. Bibl. nat. fr.* 9574.)

[See p. 447, note 2 *supra*.]

Sa manere de treiter si est itele: al commencement met un petit prolonge ou il met le nun del livre, la ou il dit: *Apocalypse* e coment la revelacion lui est faite par le aungele. Après benesquit tuz ceus ki le lisent e ki oyent les paroles de ceste prophetie, e salue les set eglises ke sunt en Asye, e demustre ke nostre très duz seigneur Jhesu Crist vendra al jugement, e tuz iceus ki ci se unt pené le verront, e se pleindront sur lui toutes gens terrienes. Après cest demustre ki il est comencement e fin, ki est e fu e est a venir tuit puissant. E après tuit cest fet sa narraciun, dunt il fet sun livre, ke est partie en set visiuns, si ke l'em poet chescune par sei severaument entendre, e dit: *Teo Johan, vostre frère, &c.* (Chap. i, verse 9).

The commentary of the French version, containing about 17,500 words, is made up of two constituent parts, the line which divides them being for the most part clearly marked. The one part consists of passages adapted from the earlier Latin commentaries, the other is the original work of the author and relates to the circumstances of the time at which the commentary was composed. Amongst the earlier commentaries, that of Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt (obit A.D. 853), though a far more copious work, seems to correspond most nearly with the French version³, and it may be noted that Gilbert de la Porée's prologue

¹ Vol. xxxv, col. 2417—2452.

² This is the point at which the first of the Seven Visions is said to begin. All the earlier commentaries begin at verse 1.

³ Haymo's Commentary is in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. cxvii, col. 937.

corresponds with Haymo's in some passages, one of which is here quoted—the corresponding passage in the French version being included :

HAYMO.

Deus Pater providens tribulationes quas passura erat sancta ecclesia postquam ab apostolis fuit fundata, disposuit cum Filio et Spiritu Sancto eas tribulationes et earum præmia revelare. Jacula que prævidentur minus ledunt. Nam levius ledit quicquid prævidimus ante. Ita Dominus Pater Christo secundum humanitatem manifestavit, Christus Joanni revelavit, Joannes ecclesiæ nuntiavit. Unde et hic liber *Apocalipsis*, id est *Revelatio*, vocatur.

GILBERT DE LA PORÉE.

Propterea videns Deus Pater tribulationes quas passura erat Ecclesia ab Apostolis fundata supra petram Christum, ut minus timeantur, disposuit una cum Filio et Spiritu Sancto eas revelare. Revelavit autem tota Trinitas Christo secundum humanitatem, Christus vero Joanni per Angelum, Joannes Ecclesiæ. De qua revelatione hunc librum composuit. Unde et liber iste *Apocalypsis* dicitur, id est *revelatio*.

FRENCH VERSION.

(*MS. Bibl. Nat. fr.* 9574.)

[See p. 447, note 2 *supra*.]

E nostre dus pere de ceel, ke veit e seet tutes choses einz ke eles seient, vist e entendi les tribulations ke seinte Eglise fu a souffrir en ceste vie mortele, e les ordena od sun fiz e Seinte Esprit a demustrer, e tutte la Seinte Trinité, Pere e Filz et Seint Esprit, treis persones e un Deu tuit puissant, les demustra a Jhesu Crist, le filz Deu, en sa humanité; e il, par sun angele, a sun serf seint Johan euvangeliste, ke fist cest livre ke est apelez Apocalipse, ceo est a dire revelation.

Haymo's commentary, in turn, is founded upon the elaborate exposition of Ambrosius Ansbertus (circa A.D. 770)¹, on whose prologue, also, Haymo drew largely. One passage of the French Commentary, viz., where the number of the Beast² is explained by the words 'DIC LUX,' can be traced back to Victorinus (obit A.D. 303), the earliest Latin commentator on the Apocalypse³. It seems doubtful, however, whether the passage in Victorinus was not a later interpolation⁴, but in any case it is of considerable antiquity and it was adopted by Ambrosius and Haymo as well as by the author of the French version. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to compare some of the passages in the commentary of MS. Charles V with Haymo, who, as far as we can

¹ La Bigne, *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. XIII, p. 403.

² *Rev.* xiii, 18.

³ Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. v, col. 317.

⁴ *Ibid.* v. 339, note.

see, was one at least of the sources to which the author of the French work applied:

HAYMO.

(Rev. ch. i, v. 12.) Septem candelabra aurea hoc ipsum significant quod septem ecclesiæ, id est universalem Ecclesiam, dum verba eorum lumen scientiæ simul et amoris incendium probent, donis septiformis Spiritus refertam est.

(Ch. iv, 3.) Per lapidem jaspidem, qui utique viridem colorem habet, debemus intelligere claritatem divinitatis Dei Filii....Sardinis autem lapis terræ rubræ similitudinem habet, et idcirco per eum humanitas Filii Dei signatur.

(Ch. v, 3.) *Neque in coelo*, id est in angelis; *neque in terra*, id est in hominibus; *neque in inferno*, id est in animabus jam corpore exemptis.

(Ch. viii, 3.) Iste angelus alius, qui stetit ante altare, intelligitur homo Christus Deus.

Possumus et per thuribulum aureum in quo cremantur aromata, intelligere Ecclesiam.

(Ch. x, 10.) Ipsi sanctis prædicatoribus dulcis est sermo Dei in ore ad prædicandum, ad meditandum, ad exponendum; sed dum coguntur ea complere operibus, quæ docent verbis, vertitur illis in amaritudinem.

(Ch. xii, 14.) In duabus alis mulieri datis, duo intelliguntur Testamenta.

(Ch. xiii, 8.) Occisus est autem iste Agnus ab origine mundi, non in se, sed in suis membris, sicut in Abel et multis aliis.

(Ch. xiv, 20.) Calcati sunt qui erant in lacu, hoc est in æterna morte depressi sunt, non jam ut purgentur.

(Ch. xv, 2.) Mare itaque baptismum significat....Sed ipsum mare mistum est igni, et per hoc coagulatum est. In igne autem Spiritus Sanctus intelligitur.

(Ch. xvii, 5.) Per frontem Babylonis, manifestatio designatur operis. Unde Dominus dicit: *A fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.*

MS. CHARLES V.

Par les set candelabras que seint Johan vit est signifié seinte Eglise que est enluminée de set graces del Seint Espirit.

Par les colurs de ii pierres sunt signifié les ii natures en Jesu Crist, le deité et la humanité.

Ceo qu'il dit que nul ne poet fere, *ne en ciel*, ceo est angele; *ne en terre*, ceo est home; *ne desuz terre*, ceo est alme essue del cors.

Et l'autre aungele que fu en estant devant l'autel signefie le fuilz Deu en humanité.

Le censer d'or signefie seinte Glise.

Ceo que le livre fu duz en sa bouche et amer en sun ventre signefie que la parole Deu est mult pleisant a escuter et a lire et a preescher, mès mult greve sovent de mettre la en eoivre.

Par les ii eles d'egle que sunt donnés a la femme sunt signifiez les ii testamentz.

Ceo que li agniel est ocis dès le commencement del monde signefie que nostre Seigneur fu tormenté es siens dès le commencement del monde, si come en Abel, le premier ocis.

Ceo qu'il dist dehors la cité signefie que ceo n'est pas peinne porgatoere, einz est perdurable.

La mer clere comme voarre signefie le baptesme ou li peeché sont lavé; la meslée de feu signefie que la grace del Seint Espirit i est donée.

Ceo que le nun de sun secré est escrit en son frunt signefie ceo que nostre Sire dist, en l'euvangile, des ypocrites: *Par lur frunz [frui] les cognoetrez.*

(Ch. xx, 8.) Nam in his duabus gentibus omnis multitudo intelligitur reprobatorum. Gog quippe interpretatur *teetum*, Magog *de tecto*.

Et ceo signifieient les ii nuns des ii poeples, Gog et Magog, kar autant dit Gog comme *covert* et Magog comme *descovert*. Par ces ii poeples qu'il trait premierement sunt signifieié tuit li deciple Antecrist.

(Ch. xxi, 12.) Murus Ecclesiæ est Christus.

Li grant mur haut signifie Jhesu Crist.

Many more parallel passages might be cited to show the intimate connection between the French Commentary and that of Haymo¹.

We refer now to the part of the French Commentary which bears on contemporary history.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the subject of Antichrist came to occupy a prominent position in theological teaching, especially through the writings of Joachim Abbot of Floris, whose *Expositio* on the Apocalypse was written in the last years of the twelfth century. We find that Antichrist is mentioned at least forty-six times in the French Commentary. In about half these instances the interpretation does not correspond with Haymo. The French commentator speaks of Antichrist as already exercising a powerful influence in the world. The following passages are some of those which do not correspond with Haymo:

Par les chevaus appareillez en bataille est signifieié l'orguil et la fierté as deciples Antecrist. Par les coronnes ausi comme d'or et la face comme d'ome est signifieié duple ypocresie, une en lur doctrine et autre en lur vie. Par lur cheveus comme de femme est signifieié qu'il sunt mol et leger a torner en chascune vice. Par lur denz comme de leon est signifieié lur cruelté. Par lur haubers comme de fer est signifieié lur duresse encontre verité. Par le soun des eles lur grant boban qu'il unt de la surté qu'il unt (ch. ix, 7—10).

Ceo que la beste fist tuz mercher en la main destre ou en lur frunz signifie que tuit, petit et grant, se confermerunt en eovre et en cuntenance a Antecrist, et ore se conferment au mauvés prelatz. Ceo que nul ne pot acheter ne vendre s'il n'eit le merc ou le nun de la beste signifie que nul n'a poer en seinte Glise de rentes doner et recevoir, s'il n'ot merc de parenté ou avoerie par servise (ch. xiii, 16, 17).

Ceo que li tierz angele qui suit les autres dist a grant voiz que tuit cil qui aorerunt le beste et se ymage et tuit cil qui recevrunt sun merc en lur frunt ou en lur main beberunt del vin del ire Deu signifie ke cil qui sunt entechez de la fause doctrine Antecrist ou confourment lur vie a ces deciples, que sunt li faus prelat et li faus clerc, il beberunt le truble boevre en enfer pur les delicius mangiers et les delicius boevres que il unt ci; e averunt le feu de enfer pur la ardante coveitise ke il unt ci et la pueur de enfer por la luxure ou il se delitent, et ceo durra sanz fin (ch. xiv, 9—11)².

¹ Compare the respective commentaries on the following passages: *Rev.* ch. iv, 3, 4—6; v, 1—5, 6—10; vi, 2, 5—6, 7—8, 12—17; viii, 1—2, 5, 6—7, 8—9, 10—11; ix, 1—6, 7—12; x, 1—4; xi, 11—xi, 2; xi, 19; xii, 1—6; xiii, 11—14, 16—18; xiv, 1—5, 6—7, 14—16, 17—20; xv, 1—4; xvi, 17—21; xviii, 4—10; xix, 12; xx, 1—3; xxi, 1—8, 9—17, 18—20; xxii, 1—5, 20.

² Haymo compares the image of the beast with Antichrist but makes no reference to false prelates and false clerks.

Ceo qu'il funt miracles et assemblent les rois en bataille signifie que, ausi comme diables, par Antecrist et ces deciples, fera ressembler miracles enchantementz, et esmoverunt les princes encontre les crestiens, tut ausi avient il ore en S. Glise que li diables, par faus prelatz et faus clers, fet miracles et merveilles, si comme de un enfant qui ne set mie garder une pome fet il gardein de almes a millers¹, et corrompent les princes par mauvese essample (ch. xvi, 14).

Ceo que li angele moustra a saint Johan la dampnatiun de la grant bordelere signifie que Nostre Sire fet entendre au bon prelat que la dampnatiun Antecrist et de ces deciples sera por ydolatrie et avarice et luxure, kar par la bordelerie que siet sur meintes eves est signifié Antecrist qui regnera sure mainz poeples, et li faus prelat qui coveient les grans richesses, que sunt signifié par les eves, et veolent estre honuré et cremuz en terre plus que a eus ne apent. Ceo que li prince de terre unt fet lur fornicatiun ove la bordelere signifie que li lai prennent esample de Antecrist et de faus religius et des asez clers de vivre en delices (ch. xvii, 1, 2).

La femme qui seeit sur la best rouge signifie Antecrist et les siens qui meinent deliciose vie en ce monde²...Ceo qu'ele estoit vestue de purpre et aornée de or signifie qu'il ressemblent a la sote gent du monde, sages pur les honurs et les richesses qu'il unt (ch. xvii, 3, 4).

Par les x rois qui serunt suggez a Antecrist sunt signefiez li haut home du monde qui guerraent par oeuvre les x commandementz Deu³. Touz unt un conseil; ceo est le conseil du monde, por conquerre a droit et a tort de lur suggez et de lur promes⁴. Lur poer et lur vertu livrerent a la beste, kar tut lur aage et lur sen despendent il ou servise au deable. Et, si come les rois desuz Antecrist se combatirent ove le agnel et a ses membres, por eus tolir la foi Jhesu Crist, tout ausint cil qui ore sunt guerraent S. Eglise, ne mie soulement en temporens chose, mès espriteument, kar par les taillages et les toutes ke il funt destreingnent il la menue gent a pecher; mès li agnel veintra au jugement, kar tuit li jugement sunt donné au fiulz Deu, et li juge sunt leal. Ceo qu'il dit que les eves sur que la femme seeit sunt plusurs genz signifie que le plus du monde suivra Antecrist quant il vendra, et ore sunt en charnel delit (ch. xvii, 12-15).

'The heretics' are one of the special objects of attack by the author of the French Commentary:

Par Jezabel sunt signifié li maistre herite ki vivent solunc la volenté de la char, et ensement enseignent encuntre l'evangile. Ceus ne doivent pas Crestiens suffrir entre eus, puis qu'il sunt endureci en lur folie, si come dit li apostre (ch. ii, 20).

Par le cheval neir sunt signifié li herite en ki deable regne. Par la balance est signifié discretiun, qu'il dient qu'il unt en escripture, mès la predication del evangile les defent qu'il ne damagent ceus que Nostre Sire a rachaté de sun sanc (ch. vi, 5, 6).

Par l'esteille que chei del ciel en terre est signifié le diable qui oeuvre le puiz de abyne; ceo est la subtile heresie que est en queors au deciples Antecrist. La

¹ This refers to the practice of presenting young children, even females, or idiots, to benefices, that the profits might be retained in the family. Pope Innocent III complains of these transactions in a letter to the Abbess of Remiremont in Lorraine in 1202. He says that clerks who hold benefices of her substitute for themselves their sons or their nephews, as by right of succession, and thus render the sanctuary of God hereditary. It thus happens, he continues, that infants of five years, or even idiots, obtain cures. If the clerk has no son or nephew, but a niece, he gives it to her as a dot (Luchaire, *Innocent III, Le Concile de Latran*, etc. 104; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. ccxiv, col. 1035). Lea (*Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 16) says, quoting St Bernard: 'Boys were inducted into the episcopate at an age when they rejoiced rather at escaping from the ferule of their teachers than at acquiring rule.'

² Other MSS. have 'ceste siècle' for 'ce monde.'

³ See also the Commentary on ch. xii 3, where the ten horns of the dragon are likened to 'the richesses del monde dunt li prince guerraent les x commandementz Deu.'

⁴ See also the Commentary on ch. xxi, 8: 'Par les homicides sunt signifié ceus qui lur prume ocient corporeument ou espirituelment.'

fumée que en surt et enoccurcist le soleil signefie la fause doctrine que fera enoscurcir la fei en plusurs (ch. ix, 1, 2).

Li chevalier signefient li tyrant del monde ; les chevaus les herites qui funt les autres mesfere par lur enseignement. Par le feu que issi des bouches au chevaus est signifié coveitesse a quei turne le prechement as herites ; par la fumée orgueil ; par la suffre luxure. De ces trois pecchiez sunt armé li chevalier, et de ceus trois pecchiez sont corrompu une grant partie des genz de ce monde. Ceo que la poesté au chevaus est en lur bouches et en lur keuves signefie que, par fause doctrine et par essaumple de mauvese vie et de males overes, deceverent il les autres (ch. ix, 16—19).

Ceo signefie que li deable prent compaignie des princes del monde et de eus efforce sa bataille encuntre seinte Glise. Par ceo que la beste ressembla lepard, que est de diverse color, sunt signifié li herite et li ypocrite que sunt de divers entendement en error, et mauvés dedenz et aperent bon dehors. Par les pates de urs sunt signifié li cruel ravisseur ; par la gule del leon les menaces as orguillus poessanz¹ (ch. xiii, 1—3).

Ceo que les flueves et les funteignes devindrent sanc par la fiole au tierz angele que est espandue signefie que ceus serunt dampné que unt corrompu les escriptures et unt turné la douçur del espiritel entendement en ordure de charnel sens, si comme funt li herite et cil qui preeschent por temporeus choses, et cil qui turnent l'euvangile en pleiderie (ch. xvi, 4).

La bouche au dragun signefie l'enticement au diable ; la bouche de la beste les parolles Antecrist ; la bouche au faus prophetes, la fause doctrine de ces preescheors et des herites. De ces trois issent iii espiriz orz ; ces sunt orguil, coveitisse et luxure. Icez ressemblent reenes, kar il habitent en ord liu, et par le cri de lur fause doctrine tolent as autres lur repos (ch. xvi, 13).

Par ces ii poeples [Gog and Magog] qu'il trait premierement sunt signifié tuit li deciple Antecrist. Par Gog sunt signifié cil qui nuisent privément, si come les herites que ore sunt. Par Magog sunt signifié li herite qui lors precheront apertement, et li tyrant qui occirront ceus qui ne se voudrunt renaer (ch. xx, 7).

Ici sunt escommeniez li felun Gius pullant ki renient la veraie lestre de S. Escripiture, et li herites mescreanz qui la corrompent par faus entendement et li faus decretite qui torne S. Escripiture, que est de espirite, a pleiderie por ces temporeus choses gaanier, et li faus preeschor qui preeschent pur veine gloire et por terrienes richeces (ch. xxii, 18, 19).

Probably by the false preachers mentioned in the last extract are intended rather the schismatics or heretics than preachers within the Church, but whether this is so or not, there is no doubt that the writer aimed at abuses within the Church as well as without. This is proved by his reference to false prelates and false clerks, of which several instances have already been cited². The following extracts relate to the same subject:

Par le ymage de la beste sunt signifié li faus prelat qui sunt fet par le conseil et l'enticement de ceus qui querent ces temporeus choses. Li espirite de parler que est doné al ymage signefie le poer de mauferre qu'il recevent par l'acheisin de la dignité. Ceo que cil sunt ocis qui ne voelent aorer le ymage signefie que erraument sunt escomigiez et tenez maintenant por rebelles cil qui ne voelent consentir au mauvés prelaz (ch. xiii, 14, 15).

La yveresce a la femme du sanc as seinz signefie la grant venchance que Nostre Sire prendra des tyranz qui unt espandu le sanc des bons crestiens, ou ceo signefie

¹ In this passage the commentator seems to apply Haymo's interpretation to contemporary events.

² See the extracts from the Commentary on ch. xiii, 16, 17; xiv, 9—11; xvi, 14; xvii, 1, 2, on pp. 451, 2 *supra*.

la greve venchance que Nostre Sire prendra de la grant luxure et dou grant boban qui li faus clerc meinent del patremoene au crucefix (ch. xvii, 6).

Le gouverneur et le marinier signifient les prelaz en seinte Glise, granz et petiz, qui aiment hautesce terrienne. Ceo qu'il mistrent poudre sur lur chief signifie qu'il mistrent coveitise de terriennes choses et richesses sur lur queors en lur pensée, ou ce signifie repentance tardive (ch. xviii, 17—19).

Ceo ke li marchant furent prince signifie que li haut homme du monde a force prennent la ou il ne deussent rien prendre si pur lur servise nun, si come li chevalier pur le pais garder et defendre, li prelat et li precheur pur le poeple Deu enseigner et endoctriner; ou ce signifie que cil qui les autres deussent gouverner et garder funt quanque il funt pur loyer et par seignurie (ch. xviii, 23).

Preaching is a subject to which the French commentary draws special attention by numerous references. 'Predicatiun,' 'preescher,' or 'prechement' are mentioned thirty-six times and 'preeschur' twenty-six times. We quote here some of these passages:

Par sa bouche sunt signefié li bon preeschur (ch. i, 16).

Par les toneires sunt signefiez les manaces del jugement que Dieu fet par ses preescheors. Par la voiz, la promesse de gloire; par les foudres les miracles; par la grant terremote est signefié l'aspre vie que li preescheor meinent (ch. viii, 5).

Par l'egle¹ sunt signefié li prescheor qui voient loing et garnissent seinte Glise de granz tribulations que ele avera a la venue Antecrist, et nomeement ceus qui sunt trop doné al amur des terriennes choses (ch. viii, 13).

Par ses piez sunt signefié li bon preeschur qui vont de liu en autre por preescher la foi; cil sunt comme columpne de feu, kar il deivent sustenir les fiebles et espendre les refreidiz del feu de charité (ch. x, 1).

Cist dui tesmoing sunt Enoch et Helye, par qui sunt signefié li autre bon preeschor a qui Nostre Sire premet sa grace, et amoneste qu'il ne faillent en petite adversité, quant cil durrunt tant en si grant persecution. Ceo qu'il serront covert de sacs signifie que li preeschur et li prelat deivent doner essample de penance as autres. Ceo qu'il sunt dui olive signifie qu'il deivent estre plein de misericorde. Ceo qu'il sunt candelabre luisant signifie qu'il deivent les autres enluminer par bone doctrine et seinte et par bone essample. Ceo qu'il sunt en estant signifie qu'il ne deivent prendre des choses temporeus fors lur sustenement, si come dist li apostle S. Pol: 'Si nos eum dont nos seum nurri et covert, seum de ceo paé.' Ceo que le feu istra de lur bouches et devorera les enemis, signifie qu'il se deivent combatre de espée espiritele, ceo est la parole Dieu que est feu, et ne mie par poer terrienne. Par la pluie del ciel sunt signefié les manaces as orguillus puissanz, ke li bon preeschor unt poer de clore, qu'il ne saent cremuz. Par les eves sunt signefié li luxurius, qui li bon preeschor tornent en sanc, quant il les font cognoestre lur ordure. Par la terre sunt signefié, li aver, que li bon preeschor firent de toutes plaies quant il les funt tout guerpir et suffrir meseies por Dieu (ch. xi, 3—6).

La semence dont ele est grosse est la parole Dieu. L'anguisse qu'ele a d'enfanter signifie l'apreté de vie que li bon preeschur aveient por les autres convertir. Le crier signifie le preeschement (ch. xii, 2).

Par le autre angele volant par mi le ciel sunt signefié li preeschor Nostre Seignur, ki, par les eles de bien enseigner et de bien ovrer, sunt plus haut des autres en Seinte Glise, et vunt de liu en autre por preescher l'euvangile de vie pardurable a totes genz, et creindre Deu comme seignur, et lesser les maus a fere pur lui, et lui honorer par bone vie et par bien fere (ch. xiv, 6, 7).

Li secund angele ki dist: Chaet est, chaet Babyloine, signifie que li preeschor garnissent seinte Glise et li dient que la gent del monde, que est signefié par Babyloine, charront en dampnation de cors et de alme pur les pechiez qu'il funt et pur les mauveses essamples dunt il enivrent les autres (ch. xiv, 8).

¹ Compare the Authorised with the Revised Version.

Le overture del temple signifie que les secrez de Sainte Glise sunt demustrez par les preescheurs que sunt issu en toutes terres (ch. xv, 5).

These extracts show that the French Commentary was composed at a time when the spirit of Antichrist was believed to be abroad—when the Church was being attacked by false brethren within and heretics without—but at a time when good preachers were going about from place to place and in all lands, exhorting men to uphold the true faith and preaching the ‘gospel of everlasting life’¹. Avarice, luxury and pride are prevalent sins; the prelates are proud, they seek after temporal things and abuse their powers². The ‘faus religius’ and ‘aesez clers’ live in luxury and voluptuousness³. The false decretists turn Holy Scripture into ‘pleiderie’ for temporal objects⁴. Not only haughty prelates but also princes, tyrants and the great and rich men of the world are denounced as enemies of the faith⁵. Riches and other temporal things are frequently referred to and represented as a snare⁶. The ten kings who shall make war with the lamb (*Rev.* xvii, 12–14) represent those who now are warring against Holy Church and compelling her to pay tallage⁷. The ‘sage (or “bone”) gent de religiun,’ or ‘sage religius,’ are held up as examples of an austere and holy life⁸. Towards the end of the world the religious shall increase and men shall despise earthly glory for hope of the glory everlasting⁹. At what period, within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, do these conditions apply to the Church?

¹ The expression ‘l’euvangile de vie pardurable’ is a gloss upon the Scriptural text which in the French version runs: ‘qui a l’euvangile que tuz jurz durra.’

² See, in addition to the passages of the French Commentary quoted above, ch. ii, 8–11, 12–17; v, 6; vi, 8; viii, 7; xii, 4, 16; xiv, 6, 18, 20; xviii, 1–3, 8; xx, 11. As to ‘faus crestiens,’ see ch. iii, 15; vi, 8, 13; xi, 2; xvi, 19.

³ *Ibid.* ch. xvii, 2, 6. The passage ‘Par la lumiere de lanterne est signifié boban de biau servise du siècle en hostel’ (ch. xviii, 23), may refer to the extravagance of monastic bodies vying with each other in the lavish entertainment of visitors.

⁴ Ch. xxii, 18, 19; xvi, 4. M. Meyer thinks that the commentator is here aiming at those who debase the preaching of the Gospel to the profession of an advocate, devoting themselves to it for the profit which they hope to obtain. Delisle and Meyer, (*Vocab.*) 137.

⁵ *Commentary*, ch. v, 6; vi, 4, 12; ix, 10, 16; xi, 13; xii, 3; xiii, 1; xiv, 1, 20; xvi, 2, 12, 14, 16; xvii, 2, 6, 12; xviii, 9, 23, 24; xx, 7.

⁶ *Ibid.* ch. i, 7; ii, 22; iv, 2; vi, 8; viii, 7, 13; ix, 10; xi, 4, 5, 7, 10; xii, 1, 9, 16; xiii, 8, 11, 14–15; xiv, 16, 20; xvi, 2, 4, 12, 15; xvii, 1, 2, 4, 8, 14; xviii, 1–2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 19, 21; xx, 13; xxi, 8, 21, 23; xxii, 18–19.

⁷ See the passage p. 452 *supra*; and see further p. 462 *infra*.

⁸ *Commentary*, ch. i, 14; iv, 7; x, 1; xiv, 2; xxi, 20.

⁹ ‘Creistra la religiun & guerpiron terrienne gloire pur esperance de cele gloire pardurable’ (*Com.* ch. xxii, 24). The old English translation (*Brit. Mus. Roy.* 17 A. xxvi) runs: ‘The religius of God schulen wax more & more and men schul forsake worldly blisse for hope of the blisse aboue.’

II.

Towards the end of the twelfth century, in Italy, France and Spain, where the Romance language was spoken, many causes contributed to a demand for a translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular. The preaching of St Bernard in the language of the people had paved the way. A general expectation of the fulfilment of prophecy in the coming of Antichrist and the Day of Judgement, the evil condition of the clergy bringing religion into contempt and calling aloud for reform, the songs of the Troubadours denouncing the clergy and advocating religious liberty, the prevalence of what came to be called the Albigensian heresy, whereby the Scriptures were perverted and the authority of the Church was denied¹; all these causes combined to stir men's minds and promote enquiry after the truth as contained in Holy Scripture². In 1170 Peter Waldo founded the sect known as 'The Poor Men of Lyons' or Waldenses, whose basis was a life of poverty and the teaching of the Scriptures. Waldo had the Bible, or a great part of it, translated into the Romance language and submitted the work to Pope Alexander III. The matter was considered at the third Lateran Council in 1179, and Waldo was forbidden to preach or expound the Scriptures. The Waldenses continued to preach, notwithstanding, and were excommunicated by Lucius III in 1183³. In April 1198 Innocent III issued a mandate of outlawry against the heretics, naming, amongst others, the Waldenses⁴. In July 1199 Innocent, writing to the Bishop of Metz, condemns preaching by the laity and women, but seems not to disapprove of the study of the Scriptures in the vernacular. He expresses ignorance of the life and opinions of those who have made the translation, and directs the Bishop to report who was the author of it and what was his intention, of what faith were those who used it, what was the motive of the teaching, and whether the teachers revered the Apostolic See and the Catholic Church⁵.

By 1206 the influence of the heretics had so greatly increased that the Pope's legates who had been sent to the Province of Narbonne to

¹ In the thirteenth century the Albigenses, Catarini, Patarini, etc. were called in official documents simply 'the heretics.' If the Waldenses were included they were mentioned separately (S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, 96). Perhaps the latter are represented by the 'faus cristiens' mentioned in the French Commentary: 'Ceo que poosté lui est donnée sur quatre parties de la terre signifie qu'il a seignourie sur Gius et sur paens, herites et faus cristiens' (*Com.* on ch. vi, 8).

² See Gilly, *The Romaunt version of St John's Gospel*, pp. xvii—xix.

³ Neander trans. Torrey, *Hist. of the Christian Religion*, viii, pp. 353 etc.; S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, p. 176.

⁴ *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. i, No. 94.

⁵ *Ibid.* Lib. ii, Nos. 141, 142.

contend with them were about to turn back in despair. However, by the advice of Diego, Bishop of Osma, in Castile, and his companion, St Dominic, lately a Canon of Osma, who met the legates at Montpellier, the latter were induced to renew their efforts, and profiting by the example of the heretics, they dismissed their retinue, formed a body of preachers which included Diego and Dominic, and went about from place to place in absolute poverty, preaching the Gospel and confuting the errors of the heretics¹. The institution of this mission was enjoined by Innocent III's letter to his legate dated November 17, 1206, 'ut contra hereticos insurgentes in provincia Narbonensi praedicatores instituat².' In a letter of December 21 Innocent refers to the evils rampant in the Church and compares the heretics and false brethren to the black horse of the Apocalypse upon which the Devil sits³. Innocent was apt to turn to the Apocalypse for his similes. He refers to the heretical churches as belonging to the Synagogue of Satan⁴, compares the heretics with the locusts that came out of the smoke of the pit⁵, and likens the Count of Toulouse to the red horse with whom was joined the black horse of heresy⁶.

The doctrine of the Waldenses contained none of the more mischievous errors of the Cathari and other heretics, and Innocent III seems to have been hopeful of bringing them back to the true fold. In 1207 Durand de Huesca, a leader of the Waldenses in Arragon, was converted to the faith, it is supposed by Dominic, and brought with him a number of followers who, under the sanction of Innocent, formed themselves into a body of missionary preachers with the title of 'Pauperes Catholici.' They lived a life of poverty and devoted themselves to reclaiming the heretics. Durand is said to have written several tracts against his former heresy⁷. He and his followers were treated with special favour. On December 17, 1208, Innocent wrote to the Archbishop of Tarragona recommending Durand to him, and by a letter of the same date the Pope granted to those of Durand's counsel who should be engaged in secular business that they should not be compelled to go to war against Christians or to take an oath in secular matters, but without prejudice to the rights of others⁸. In a

¹ See Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 140—2.

² *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. IX, No. 185.

³ *Ibid.* Lib. IX, No. 208.

⁴ *Ibid.* Lib. I, No. 94.

⁵ *Ibid.* Lib. II, No. 99.

⁶ *Ibid.* Lib. XVI, No. 167.

⁷ Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 246.

⁸ *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. XI, Nos. 196—8. 'Going to war against Christians' may imply that Durand's followers were not to be called upon to fight against their brother Waldenses, who, if heretical in some of their opinions, were professing Christians.

letter of April 3, 1209, to the Archbishop of Milan, Innocent refers to Durand as his 'dilectus filius.' In reply to a complaint of the Archbishop of Narbonne that Durand acts unfaithfully, deceives the Church of Rome and eludes canonical discipline, Innocent writes on July 5, 1209, recommending moderation towards him, and he writes in similar terms to the Archbishop of Tarragona. He writes also to Durand and his brethren that they are accused by the Archbishop of Narbonne and other bishops of boasting of the Pope's favour and being insolent to them and of being guilty of heretical practices, and he expostulates with him on these points. In May 1210 Innocent addresses Durand and his brethren as 'dilecti in Domino filii' and grants them protection. On the same date he writes to the Archbishops of Narbonne and Tarragona recommending his beloved son Durand to their protection, and commands the last-named prelate and his suffragans not to repel him¹. In 1212 Durand and the *Pauperes Catholici* were still under the Pope's protection². Thenceforward little is heard of them³ but the example of their preaching and their poverty was not lost upon the founders of the two great mendicant orders which were soon to come into existence.

St Dominic's birthplace was in Old Castile, the country from which one of the two Latin versions of the French commentary came⁴. He was born in 1170. We have seen how, in company with his bishop, he visited Montpellier and joined in a mission of poor preachers in 1206⁵. When the bishop returned to Spain in 1207 Dominic remained behind and became sub-prior of Prouille, where he had founded a community of women. From 1207 to 1214 Dominic preached among the heretics of Languedoc. In the latter year he gathered a band of workers for whom a citizen of Toulouse provided a house and the bishop of the diocese an endowment of a portion of the tithes. This enabled the missionaries to purchase books and other necessities and to qualify themselves for preaching, which was their main object⁶. The Pope's approval was obtained in 1215, but Innocent died in July of that year, and his successor Honorius III finally sanctioned the Order of *Fratres Prædicatores* in December 1216. In 1220 the Dominicans followed the Franciscans in adopting a vow of poverty. Dominic died in 1221. The members of his Order were not, like monks, devoted to contemplation, but were trained to an active life, to study theology and rhetoric, and

¹ *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. xii, Nos. 17, 66—69, Lib. xiii, Nos. 63, 77, 78.

² *Ibid.* Lib. xv, Nos. 82, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96.

³ In 1237 Gregory IX orders them to be reformed. In 1247 Innocent IV restrains them from preaching (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, i, p. 248).

⁴ See p. 446 *supra* and Delisle and Meyer, cXLVI.

⁵ p. 457 *supra*.

⁶ Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, i, p. 251.

to mix with the world—preaching to save souls¹. They also spent much time in reading the Scriptures and writing books². Dominic is supposed to have written two books against the Albigenses and commentaries on the Psalms, St Matthew's Gospel and St Paul's Epistles³. In 1217 he dispersed his followers to preach in Paris and Bologna and in Spain; in Paris they founded the convent of the Jacobins⁴; about 1221 they settled in London and in Oxford. Their convents were real houses of study⁵.

The Franciscans, whose Order of *Fratres Minores* was in an elementary stage in 1210⁶, were from the first required to live according to the Gospel in obedience and chastity without possessing property. Faculties for preaching were to be issued by the head of the Order, but no brother was to preach without the sanction of the bishop of the diocese⁷. St Francis discouraged the acquisition of learning. One of the rules of the Order was: 'Let the brethren who cannot read be not anxious to learn, but rather let them seek to have the spirit of the Lord.' St Francis died in 1226. It was not until some years later that his followers took to study, some of them becoming teachers at the Universities⁸. The members of both Orders preached, and the members of both professed poverty, but preaching was the special object of the Dominicans, as indicated by their title, and poverty was the watchword of the Franciscans.

The relation which the Dominican bore to the Franciscan is shown by Matthew Paris' report of the dispute about precedence between the two Orders in 1243⁹. According to him the Preachers argued that they had deservedly obtained their name and office from their preaching, and were more truly distinguished by the apostolic dignity; the Minorites alleged that they had chosen a more rigorous and humble life, and so the more worthy because more holy. If we search for our author amongst the Friars we shall expect to find him amongst the Dominicans rather than the Franciscans. Albertus Magnus and St Thomas Aquinas, who incorporated Gilbert de la Porée's prologue, or the substance of it, in their commentaries on the Apocalypse, were both Dominicans. A modern writer has thus expressed himself with regard to the early

¹ Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 252.

² S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, p. 397.

³ Drane, *Hist. of St Dominic*, p. 475; Guiraud, *St Dominic*, trans. K. de Mattos, p. 159.

⁴ Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 254—5.

⁵ Guiraud, *ut supra*, p. 160.

⁶ See p. 446, note 5 *supra*.

⁷ Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 257—60.

⁸ Cuthbert, *The Friars*, pp. 49—52.

⁹ *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series), iv, p. 279.

Dominicans, 'Un autre trait caractérise les premiers essais de la prédication dominicaine. Pauvre, car ce n'est pas en vain qu'ils portent le nom de Mendicants, c'est contre les riches et les puissants de la terre, contre leur luxe, leurs plaisirs et leurs vices qu'ils exercent leur zèle apostolique. Ils ont aussi emprunté aux Pères de l'Église latine, des peintures plus sombres du monde futur, le retour plus fréquent des idées de damnation et d'enfer¹.' The 'puissants' of the earth, by that description, are attacked in the French Commentary² and the many references to 'judgement,' 'damnation' and 'hell,' including the notion that the elect will rejoice at the torments of the wicked, point to the author's having been influenced by the gloomy doctrines of the Dominicans³.

That the author was a regular and not a secular seems to be proved by his attacks on 'the false prelates and false clerks⁴,' and by his upholding the 'bone gent de religion' and the 'sages religieux⁵.' The Albigenian Crusade, when the north of France was arrayed against the south for twenty years to suppress heresy at the point of the sword, or the years following the Crusade, must have been present to the mind of the author whose commentary contains so many references to 'the heretics.' We have shown that this title represented all the heretics of southern France except the Waldenses⁶. When the Crusade came to an end in 1229 heresy was for a time suppressed in southern France, but it continued to flourish in some of the cities of north Italy, especially Milan, until or beyond the middle of the century. Avarice, luxury and pride, within or without the church, are condemned by the French Commentator; Innocent III, in a sermon preached before the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, proclaimed that the corruption of the people had its chief source in the clergy⁷ and the decrees of that Council make stringent regulations for the reform of the clergy. The poem called *Gera pigra*, written about 1219 but referring to the time of Innocent III, is a satire against the pride, luxury and irreligion of the

¹ L'Abbé Bernard, *Les Dominicains dans l'Université de Paris*, p. 484.

² *Com.* on ch. v, 5; vi, 4; xi, 6.

³ It has been said that the Franciscans appealed to love, the Dominicans to fear (Kington, *Hist. of Frederick II*, i, 78). 'Judgement' is referred to 29 times, 'damnation' 27 times, and 'hell' 21 times in the French Commentary. There are five passages referring to the share which the saints are to have in the judgement of the wicked. One of these is as follows: 'Le manger et les chars des uns et des autres signifie la grant delit que seint averont au jugement des tormenz a dampnez' (ch. xix, 18). See also the Commentary on xiv, 17; xviii, 6, 20; xix, 21. This doctrine was enunciated by Gregory the Great and quoted with approval by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, i, p. 240).

⁴ See p. 453 *supra*.

⁶ See p. 456, note 1 *supra*.

⁵ See p. 455 *supra*.

⁷ Innocent III, *Sermones de diversis*, Sermo VI.

French hierarchy¹. Joachim of Floris, who died in 1202, exposed the worldliness of the clergy and spoke of the prelates, proud and defiled, as opposed to the good prelates, simple minded and humble of heart². Peter Cantor, who died in 1197, in his *Verbum Abbreviatum* of 153 chapters, attacks the abuses in Church and State³. His work is instructive in the manners and customs of that age. Matters were much in the same condition as they had been in the time of St Bernard. That great preacher had spoken out very plainly: 'They are ministers of Christ and they are serving Antichrist. They are advanced to honour upon the goods of the Lord, and to the Lord they render no honour at all. From this proceeds that meretricious splendour, that habit fit for a comedian, that magnificence almost royal which you see every day. Because of this you see gold upon the bits of their horses, upon their saddles and even upon their spurs; yes, their spurs shine more brightly than their altars. Because of this you see fine tables loaded with splendid services of plate, chased goblets, and also with viands correspondingly costly. Then follow merry makings and drunkenness, the guitar, the lyre and the flute. Thence come groaning winepresses and storehouses full and overflowing with all manner of good things. Thence come vases of rich perfumes and coffers filled with immense treasures. It is for the attainment of such objects that they desire to be and are Provosts of Churches, Deans, Archdeacons, Bishops, Archbishops. For these dignities are not given for merit but are disposed of in that infamous traffic which walketh in darkness⁴.' Of the lower orders of the clergy he says: 'The evil living of the clergy, the mother of which is episcopal negligence, is everywhere disturbing and weakening the Church. The bishops give what is holy to dogs and cast pearls before swine who turn again and rend them. But it is only right that they should have to suffer from those that they foster. They do not correct those whom they enrich with the goods of the Church, and therefore they are grieved and wearied with their misconduct⁵.'

We see here that with regard to the corruption of the clergy the attacks of the author of the French Commentary are as applicable to the twelfth century as to the thirteenth, and the same thing may be said with regard to the heretics, who were condemned by the Third Lateran Council in 1179 and by the Council of Toulouse in 1119⁶; but

¹ Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, v, p. 252 note.

² Fournier, *Études sur Joachim de Flore*, pp. 8, 9; Joachim, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, fo. 119 a.

³ Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. ccv, cols. 21—368.

⁴ Mabillon, *Works of St Bernard*, trans. Eales, iv, pp. 223—4.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii, p. 479.

⁶ S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, pp. 90, 175.

one distinguishing mark of the French Commentary is the frequent reference to preachers and preaching. It is alive with the spirit of the early part of the thirteenth century. The attempt was to be made to conquer heresy and purify the Church by the spiritual weapons of preaching and the example of a life of poverty. Preaching and the renunciation of earthly riches are themes on which the French Commentator dwells persistently¹. One passage relating to current events seems, above all, to have a material bearing on the date of the work. This passage is quoted on p. 452 *supra* and forms the commentary on chapter xvii, vv. 12—15. It is thus rendered in the old English translation²:

And these ben the kyngis that undirlyngis bee to anticrist and bitokeneth the grete lordyngis of this world that thorough envye weren agen goddis commandements. Alle thei have oon counseil, that is the counseil of the world for to taken with right & with wrong of her underlyngis and of here neighebores. Her vertu and her power their schulen deliveren to the beeste; for alle here eld al here wit thei hav dispendid in the develis service. And as the kyngis undur Anticrist schulen fighten agenne the lomb and his membris for to bynymen them the right beleve that thei hav in Jhesu Crist, right also tho that ben now fighten agenst holi chirche & not oonli in bodili thingis but in goostli also, for thorough the taliage that thei maken thei bryngen the symple folk in to synne.

This passage suggests a great lord who not only makes profit out of his lay subjects, but also levies taxes on the clergy, who is at war with the Church spiritually and temporally and who breaks all or most of the ten commandments. Two monarchs may be suggested as answering to this description. One is King John of England; the other is the Emperor Frederick II.

Before John had been a year on the throne he had a violent quarrel with the heads of some of the Cistercian houses in Yorkshire because they claimed exemption from the plough tax. In January 1204 he levied a tax of a seventh of moveables which fell upon all classes, including the clergy. In 1207 he proposed a tax to be levied on the holders of ecclesiastical benefices to which the bishops replied that the Church could not submit to a demand which had been unheard of in previous ages. John substituted a demand of a thirteenth of the moveables of the laity which was unwillingly granted; he then proceeded to collect the thirteenth from the clergy also. Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, forbade the clergy of his province to comply, and, having excommunicated all who should pay the tax as well as the collectors of it, fled

¹ As to preaching see p. 454 *supra*. As to earthly riches see the Commentary on ch. ii, 10, 22; iv, 2; viii, 7, 13; ix, 10; xi, 4, 7, 10; xii, 1, 9, 16; xiii, 8, 11, 14, 14—15; xiv, 16, 20; xvi, 2, 4, 12, 15; xvii, 1, 2, 4, 8, 14; xviii, 7, 8, 15, 19, 21; xx, 13; xxi, 8, 21; xxii, 18, 19.

² Brit. Mus. Roy. 17 A. xxvi.

over sea¹. John thereupon seized the goods and revenues of the archbishop. By letter of Dec. 18, 1207² Innocent III directed the Bishops of Worcester, Ely and Hereford to expostulate with the king and, if this should be ineffectual, to lay the province of York under an interdict. Meanwhile John's refusal to accept Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury was widening the breach with the Church, and in March 1208 the whole realm was laid under interdict. The spoiling of the Church went on. John argued that as the clergy were unable to perform their duty they were no longer entitled to receive any remuneration, and so seized upon their revenues³. In 1211 John was supplying his brother-in-law, Count Raymond of Toulouse, with means to resist the Albigensian crusaders. In June or July of that year the Pope's legates pronounced sentence of excommunication upon John, absolving his subjects from their allegiance and enjoining upon them obedience to the leader of any host which the Pope might send into England. In 1212 John levied £22,000 from the Cistercians for the help they were alleged to have given to the enemies of Count Raymond, and the English clergy were forced to acknowledge by deed that all the money John had received from them since his accession was a free gift. In January 1213 Innocent directed Philip Augustus of France to expel John from his realm and assume the sovereignty of England; he also directed other European princes to join Philip, and all who took part in the expedition were to enjoy the privileges of pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre. In the following May John submitted and surrendered the realm to the Pope. In June 1214 an aid was levied for the relaxation of the interdict, and the bishops were compensated for their losses. The lower clergy and the religious houses were ignored, and the king obtained from some of them an acknowledgment that their contributions during the period of the interdict had been voluntary⁴.

In a sense John was warring against the Church from the beginning of his reign until his submission to the Pope, and if the passage we have quoted from the French Commentary does in fact refer to John it

¹ Miss Norgate, *John Lackland*, pp. 73, 101, 125—7; *Ib.* 'Geoffrey of York' in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The passage quoted above, 'for thorough the taliage that thei maken thei bryngen the symple folk in to synne,' suggests a possible connection with the Archbishop's excommunication of all who should pay the tax as well as the collectors of it. The Archbishop's complaint was that the king 'ab ecclesiis et elemosynis Eboracensis provinciæ tertiam decimam disposuisset recipere,' and 'non solum de dominio ipsius et ab ipso tenentibus, sed etiam a religiosis et plerisque clericis Eboracensis provinciæ tertiam decimam suorum proventuum contra ecclesiasticam libertatem recepit' (*Innocent. III Regest. Lib. xi, No. 87*).

² *Ibid.* Lib. x, No. 172.

³ Miss Norgate, *John Lackland*, p. 128.

⁴ Miss Norgate, *John Lackland*, *passim*.

is probable that the work originated between March 1208, when the interdict was imposed, and his submission in May 1213. Perhaps the latter part of that period is to be preferred because the teaching of Dominic had had time to spread and John's quarrel with the Church entered upon an acute stage after his excommunication in June or July 1211.

If the Emperor Frederick was in the mind of the commentator it brings us to the very end of the period which the authorities allow for the composition of the work¹. Frederick's first breach with the Church was in 1227 when, having set out on the Crusade to the Holy Land, he returned three days later on the plea of illness and was excommunicated by Gregory IX for so doing. In his sermon on the occasion Gregory complained that the bark of St Peter was assailed by the armies of the infidels; by the rage of tyrants, 'who assert their temporal claims, proscribe justice, and trample under foot the liberties of the Church'; by the folly of heretics; and by the perversity of false brethren. In the following year Frederick was under a similar sentence for embarking afresh without the Pope's sanction. In Palestine the Emperor gained possession of the Holy Sepulchre by diplomacy, and having crowned himself king in Jerusalem, he returned to Italy in July 1229. Meanwhile his territory had been ravaged by the Pope's army and a crusade had been preached against him by the Pope's emissaries, the Friars. He was also accused of having caused some Dominicans and Franciscans to be dragged through the streets of Jerusalem because they preached on Palm Sunday. In June 1229 Gregory issued a bull of excommunication against the Cathari, Publicans, Poor men of Lyons, Arnoldists, and lastly the Emperor Frederick. In September 1230 the Pope and the Emperor exchanged the kiss of peace, and thenceforward until 1239 there was no open rupture between them. One of the terms of peace was that tallage was not to be levied from the clergy. The failure to comply with this condition was alleged as one of the causes of the Emperor's excommunication in 1239². At this time the regular clergy, high and low, were no better than in the days of St Bernard; they were avaricious and immoral. In March 1239 Gregory again pronounced sentence of excommunication against the Emperor, gave his body to Satan (that his soul might be saved), absolved his subjects

¹ See p. 446 *supra*.

² See Gregory IX's bull and the letters set out by M. Paris (*Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series) III, pp. 535, 556, 570, 601; IV, p. 451) and compare the French Commentary on ch. xvii, 12—15, p. 452 *supra*. The oppression of clerks by collections and tallages is one of the grounds of the sentence of deposition against Frederick in 1245.

from their allegiance, laid under interdict every place he might be in, and degraded any ecclesiastic who should perform service for him. He was accused of stirring up insurrection in Rome, arresting a Cardinal, keeping benefices vacant, seizing the goods of churches, levying taxes on the clergy, imprisoning and banishing them, putting them to death, ill-treating, plundering and expelling from his realm all partisans of the Church, favouring the Saracens, settling them among Christians obstructing the recovery of the Holy Land, rejecting the interposition of the Pope in the affairs of the Lombards and other offences. Frederick, in reply, appealed to the Commonalty who had been stirred to hatred of him by the Dominicans and Franciscans. The Pope began his manifesto in rejoinder: 'Out of the sea is a beast arisen whose name is all over written "Blasphemy"; he has the feet of a bear, the jaws of a ravening lion, the mottled limbs of the panther. He opens his mouth to blaspheme the name of God and shoots his poisoned arrows against the tabernacle of the Lord and the Saints that dwell therein'.¹ Blasphemous sayings attributed to the Emperor were spread abroad by the Friars. Gregory complained that the German princes and prelates despised the papal anathema and adhered to Frederick. In 1240 the legate Albert von Beham was invested with full power to excommunicate them. The Bishop of Freisingen recommended the Pope, whom he calls 'This Roman priest,' to feed his own Italians: 'We, who are set by God as dogs to watch our own folds, will keep off all wolves in sheep's clothing.' The Canons of Ratisbon boasted that they would keep six hundred knights in the field for three years for the honour of Frederick and the Empire. The Bavarian clergy said they did not fear the thunders and lightnings of Rome, nor would they give a bean for the sentence of suspension and excommunication. The Dean and Chapter of Passau preached a crusade against the Pope's legate. The legate excommunicated prelates and princes, who laughed at the sentence. The legate wrote to the Pope in 1241 that if help were not sent most of the princes and prelates of Germany would enter Lombardy and aid the Emperor². While Gregory's action had the effect of driving many churchmen into the Emperor's camp, there was a great force

¹ *Rev.* xiii, 1—3. The Commentary on this, 'Ceo signifie que li deable prent compaignie des princes del monde et de eus efforce sa bataille encuntre sainte Glise,' etc. is quoted at p. 453 *supra*.

² In England the Pope's legate demanded a fifth of the revenues of the clergy towards the expenses of his war with the Emperor. While some of the bishops complied, the rectors of Berkshire withstood the exaction, alleging, amongst other reasons, that the Church of Rome had no right to tax the churches of other nations, and that the revenues of the Church ought not to be applied for the maintenance of war, especially amongst Christians (M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* iv, p. 38 *et seq.*).

working all over Christendom for the Church and against the Emperor. Gregory lavished favours upon the Dominicans and Franciscans and in every city, openly or secretly according to the circumstances, they were preaching the crusade against Frederick to all classes of people. Kington gives the substance of a typical sermon by a Friar¹. The Emperor is described as the abomination of desolation—the man of sin—the Antichrist that should come—the Beast whom St John foretold, whose mark too many in Italy had received. It is not surprising that the Emperor banished the Friars from his dominions. The war went on. In 1241 the Emperor captured the fleet conveying prelates to the Council which the Pope had summoned to be held at Easter. Many prelates perished; the rest were made prisoners and suffered great privations. Gregory died in August 1241 and was succeeded by Celestine IV, who survived less than a month. Then for nearly two years the papal throne was vacant. In June 1243 Innocent IV was elected and proved even more obstinately determined to put down the Emperor than his predecessor had been. Like Gregory he was strongly supported by the Friars. In July 1244 Innocent fled to Lyons. In July 1245 Frederick was deposed by the Council of Lyons, and Henry of Thuringia was anointed King of Germany by German prelates who had deserted Frederick's cause. Henry died in 1247 and William of Holland was crowned in his place. The war continued with unabated fury and cruelty on both sides, Lombardy being the chief centre of hostilities. The Pope and the Emperor each believed that the other had been party to a conspiracy to murder him. In 1247, by Frederick's order, a near relation of the Pope and an object of his special affection was seized and hanged because the Pope had sent legates abroad to injure the Emperor's fame and dignity. In 1248 the Bishop of Arezzo, an active partisan of the Pope, was taken prisoner by Frederick and hanged before the walls of Parma, being dragged to the gibbet at a horse's tail. Three days later the Emperor's camp was destroyed by a sally from the town, his army was routed and three thousand of them taken prisoners. The learned Thaddeus of Suessa, who had acted as the Emperor's proctor at the Council of Lyons, was amongst the prisoners. He was hewn to death piece-meal. The war had become one of extermination and treaties were disregarded. Before leaving Tuscany in 1249 Frederick gave directions that the Friars were no longer to be imprisoned or banished; they were to be tied together like foxes and burnt alive. A Franciscan for preaching revolt in Sicily was

¹ *Hist. of Frederick II*, II, p. 123.

put to death after undergoing eighteen different kinds of torture. To Vatatzes, Emperor of Nicaea, Frederick wrote in 1250: 'What right has that Pope to send Minorites and Preachers to confer with the heads of your Church? He excommunicates you by name every day and calls all your subjects heretics....Whence did these priests of ours learn to fight against Christians, to exchange the pastoral staff for the lance, and the pen for the arrow? Look at our holy Cardinals carrying on war in our empire. One is called Duke, another Marquess, another Count. This one draws up armies, that one bears a battle axe. Did they learn this from Christ's first disciples or from any general council? Ought not these priests of infamy, these false prophets, to be burnt with fire as in the days of Elijah¹? Such are the shepherds of Israel; what havoc have they not wrought in Germany, in Italy, in every land! But he who is lurking in Lyons is now held in scorn as the father of lies; his followers loathe his ways....Those friars who have been sent to you have not gone to discuss religion but to sow the tares of strife after their wonted fashion.' Well might Matthew Paris exclaim that those who read the annals of history had never found such an instance of intense and inexorable hatred as that which existed between the Pope and the Emperor. Frederick's struggle with the Church ended with his death in December 1250².

The language of the Commentary seems at first sight to be equally appropriate to the state of affairs in England from 1211 to 1213 and to that in the Empire from 1239 to 1250. The fact that all the early manuscripts of the Commentary came from England or the north of France³ may be thought to point to King John as the subject of denunciation. But there is nothing to suggest that the author wrote in the midst of the turmoil or even near at hand. The work is not primarily a polemic but a Scriptural commentary composed, it may be, far away from the scene of strife and by an author who was a thoroughly orthodox son of the Church and sympathised with the members of his own Order who were actually engaged in the struggle. If the author meant to denounce any existing potentate, this was not his chief object but only incidental to the work. The probability that he was a Friar and the frequent reference to Antichrist (which had become an epithet of abuse on both sides), to the heretics, to the false prelates and false

¹ Frederick's recollection of the story was at fault; see 1 *Kings*, xviii, 38, 40.

² As to Frederick II my authorities are: M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vol. vi; and, to a less extent, Kington, *Hist. of Frederick II*.

³ Delisle and Meyer, i.

clerks¹, to the prelates and princes, to the tyrants², seem to point to the time of Frederick II. Like King John the Emperor had levied tallage on the clergy. The organisation of the Preachers, to whom the Commentary so often refers, was in an elementary stage in 1211-13; they were not incorporated in an Order and they had not been sent forth to preach 'to all nations³.' Further, it will be observed that John never reached a state of actual warfare with the Church, while between Frederick and, first Gregory IX and then Innocent IV, there existed for several years a state of war to the death. On the whole it seems not unreasonable to conclude that the Commentary was composed in England or the north of France by a Dominican Friar, between 1239 and 1250.

J. C. Fox.

STREATLEY-ON-THAMES.

¹ See especially the reference (p. 453 *supra*) to the false prelates and false clerks who are enticed by the false doctrine of Antichrist or conform their life to that of his disciples.

² See the reference (Commentary on Rev. ch. xvii, v. 6, pp. 453, 4 *supra*) to the great vengeance which our Lord will take upon the tyrants who have shed the blood of the good Christians.

³ See *Com.* ch. xiv, 6, 7; xv, 5.

ZWEI FRIEDERIKENLIEDER.

I.

‘ERWACHE FRIEDERICKE...’

IN der neuen Ausgabe des *Jungen Goethe* 2, 57 hat Morris aus dem ersten der Friederikenlieder drei Strophen herausgeworfen und 6, 155 dies mehr als radikale Verfahren zu rechtfertigen versucht, sich die Gründe, die Th. Maurer in einer in Kleinigkeiten richtigen, im Ganzen misslungenen Arbeit¹ gegen Goethes Verfasserschaft vorbringt, zu eigen machend. Es soll hier gezeigt werden, wie wenig stichhaltig diese Gründe sind, und dass das Gedicht mit allen seinen sechs Strophen von einem einzigen Verfasser herrühren muss.

Maurer und Morris empfinden einen Widerspruch zwischen der zweiten und sechsten Strophe: Hier singe die Nachtigall, dort schweige sie. Abgesehen davon, dass solch ein ‘Widerspruch’ noch lange nichts gegen die Verfasserschaft ein und desselben Dichters beweisen würde—eher das Gegenteil: Derjenige, der ein solch kleines Gedicht in der von Morris angenommenen Weise ausbaut, hütet sich weit mehr vor Widersprüchen als der ursprüngliche Autor—besteht hier nicht der geringste Widerspruch, und wer einen solchen empfindet, ist eben nicht fähig, Situation und Stimmung des Gedichts voll zu erfassen:

Horch Philomelens Kummer
Schweigt heute still
Weil Dich der böse Schlummer
Nicht meiden will.

Die Nachtigall, im Schlafe
Hast Du versäumt:
So höre nun zur Strafe
Was ich gereimt.

Die Nachtigall schlägt für die Liebenden, und diese lauschen des Nachts ihrem Gesange: Aber meine Liebste, sagt der Dichter, erfreut sich eines derart gesunden Schlafs, dass die Nachtigall das Singen für diesmal als zwecklos aufgegeben hat! Damit deutet er scherzhaft den Umstand aus, dass sie in diesem Augenblick tatsächlich schweigt: Es ist ja doch kurz vor Tagesanbruch, wo sie ihr müdes Köpfchen zum

¹ *Die Sesenheimer Lieder, Eine kritische Studie von Dr Th. Maurer (Beiträge zur Landes- und Volkskunde von Elsass-Lothringen, xxxii. Heft), Strassburg, 1907.*

Schlummer senkt. Nachher nimmt er den Scherz natürlich nicht wieder auf: 'Zur Strafe dafür, dass du den süßen Gesang der Nachtigall versäumt, hast du jetzt meine schlechten Verse anzuhören.' Gewiss hat sie die ganze Nacht über gesungen, der Dichter *sagt* eben nur: 'Wenn du Böse nicht taub gewesen wärest für die Nachtigall, dann hätte sie weitergesungen.'

Unglaublich ist, was über den Umstand, dass die Nachtigall überhaupt in dem Gedicht vorkommt, und über den Namen 'Philomele geredet wird.' Der eine konstatiert, dass dieser Vogel erst 1774 in Goethes Lieder 'eintrete'; der andere, es hänge davon ab, ob an dem Ort, wo sich der Dichter gerade aufhalte, Nachtigallen vorkämen; und der dritte behauptet gar, der Name 'Philomele' erscheine 'sonst nicht' weiter bei Goethe. Wir verlangen in solchen Fällen zu hören, dass und warum eine Abneigung gegen den Namen bestanden habe, und erwarten die Behauptung 'kommt sonst nicht vor' in der präziseren Form: 'Ich habe Goethes sämtliche Werke auf den Namen Philomele hin durchgesehen und ihn nirgends gefunden.' Das zu schreiben wird so leicht niemand wagen.

Die Wendung 'Und wär er von den Zähnen zum Kopf von Eis' soll gleichermassen 'ungoethisch' sein: Würde sie damit etwa lenzisch, dass dieser, sich an eine bekannte Virgilische Phrase anlehnend, einmal schreibt: 'Ach wie alles Eiss mir in der Brust war'? Ist dies letztere auch ungoethisch? Das Eigenartige waren gerade die Worte 'von den Zähnen zum Kopf': Diese müssten zusammen mit den andern bei Lenz nachgewiesen werden, ehe man den Einwand wenigstens diskutieren könnte.

Warum wird neben die Worte 'Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen, doch wacht er nicht' statt der Briefstelle von Lenz, 'Ich wache des Nachts mit schlafenden Augen,' nicht vorher jene berühmte Wendung aus dem Hohenliede, 'Ich schlafe, aber mein Herz wacht,' gehalten? Und wenn die Wiederholung des Bildes 'Die Nacht, die einer deiner Blicke zum Tage macht' in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* Goethes Verfasserschaft der ersten Strophe beweisen soll, warum dann nicht auch die Wiederholung der Worte 'Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen, doch wacht er nicht' eben dort dasselbe für die fünfte? Es fehlt einem der Ausdruck wenn man sieht, dass die eine Stelle erwähnt und die drei Zeilen vorher stehende unterdrückt wird: 'Es war ein Zustand, von welchem geschrieben steht: "ich schlafe, aber mein Herz wacht"; die hellen wie die dunkeln Stunden waren einander gleich; das Licht des Tages konnte das Licht der Liebe nicht überschneiden, und die Nacht wurde durch den Glanz der Neigung zum hellsten Tage,' Sätze, die in einem einzelnen Absatz von sechs

Zeilen Länge zusammenstehen! Und nun vergleiche man die nächsten Absätze: Deutlich erweist es sich, dass Goethe an unser Gedicht gedacht hat! (W. A. 29, 57, 24—59, 2). Und nochmals: Wenn sich das 'blöde Licht' des Morgens an einer Stelle der *Pandora* widerspiegeln soll, warum nicht ein Blatt vorher auch das 'wachende Schlafen'?

Phileros, nur dahin zum bedufteten Garten!
Da magst du die Fülle der Liebe dir erwarten,
Wenn Eos, die Blöde, mit glühendem Schein
Die Teppiche röthet am heiligen Schrein...

Was hilft es, und neiget das Haupt auch sich nieder,
Und sinken ohnmächtig ermüdete Glieder;
Das Herz es ist munter, es regt sich, es wacht,
Es lebt den lebendigsten Tag in der Nacht!

(W. A. 50, 302, 71 ff., 300, 42 ff.) Man sehe sich wiederum die ganze Umgebung dieser Stellen an!

Auch das eingeschobene 'O Glück' in der fünften Strophe ist nichts für Lenz charakteristisches, es ist weiter nichts als eine 'Interjektion,' lässt sich bei vielen Dichtern nachweisen und war gleich andern Interjektionen vor allem bei Klopstock und seinen Gefolgsmannen beliebt, den Goethe wohl gradeso gut kannte wie Lenz. Aber man braucht, hat man den *Jungen Goethe* (2, 57) vor sich liegen, abermals nur ein Blatt umzuwenden, und findet im Gedicht *Es schlug mein Herz* in der vierten Strophe die Interjektion 'Ihr Götter!' und in der fünften den Schluss 'Und doch, welch Glück! geliebt zu werden, Und lieben, Götter, welch ein Glück!' Wo ist der Unterschied? Hier hat man zu ergänzen: 'Welch ein Glück ist es,' dort: '...wäre es.' Ich mache mich anheischig, aus Goethes Gedichten derartiger Ausrufe weit mehr als aus Lenzens zu sammeln. Und zu solcher Sorte von Beweisen finden sich überall schon in nächster Nähe die Gegenbeweise. Warum z. B. wird 'Dem Himmel wachsend entgegen' nicht auch Lenz zugeschrieben mit Rücksicht auf 'Dir, Himmel wächst er kühn entgegen' (*Werke*, Blei, 1, 76)? Da wird man einfach die Bekanntschaft Lenzens mit Goethes Gedicht annehmen: Aber weshalb dann nicht auch bei den sogenannten Parallelen in seinen andern Gedichten und Briefen, die für Lenzens Verfasserschaft der drei Strophen sprechen sollen?

Man wird des Handels satt sein und lieber die positiven Gründe anhören, die für Goethes Recht vorzubringen sind. Binden die oben zitierten Stellenpaare aus *Dichtung und Wahrheit* und *Pandora* zwei von den beanstandeten Strophen, 3 und 5, mit 1 nachträglich und äusserlich zusammen, so lassen sich anderseits die Quellen nachweisen, aus denen gemeinsam die verschiedenen Strophen gespeist worden sind.

Ich werde dabei aus bestimmten Gründen etwas weiter ausholen als es für gegenwärtigen Zweck erforderlich wäre. Bedauerlicherweise steht mir Edward Schröders Untersuchung¹ nicht zur Verfügung.

Die Strophe zeigt von vornherein, dass wir wahrscheinlich anakreon-tische Töne mit Wendungen aus anakreontischen Gedichten zu hören bekommen werden. Ist es doch die Form, die in so vielen, vorab *An den Schlaf* o. ä. überschriebenen Gedichten, auch in ironisierenden Romanzen, von Gleim, Löwen, Schiebeler, Gerstenberg, Hagedorn, Eschenburg usw. erscheint. Von Haus aus aber ist sie französischen Ursprungs, und so finden wir sie bereits bei den deutschen Schülern Ronsards, gradeso wie die erweiterte Form, vom Typus 'Ich denke dein, wenn mir der Sonne Schimmer / Vom Meere strahlt,' französischer Herkunft ist. Opitz's Gedicht,

Ach, Liebste, lass uns eilen,
Wir haben Zeit,
Es schadet das Verweilen
Uns beiderseit.

Der edlen Schönheit Gaben
Fliehn Fuss für Fuss,
Dass alles, was wir haben,
Verschwinden muss.

Der Wangen Zier verbleicht,
Das Haar wird greis,
Der Augen Feuer weicht,
Die Brunst wird Eis.

Das Mündlein von Corallen
Wird ungestalt,
Die Händ' als Schnee verfallen,
Und du wirst alt.

Drum lass uns jetzt genießen
Der Tugend Frucht,
Eh' als wir folgen müssen
Der Jahre Flucht.

Wo du dich selber liebest,
So liebe mich,
Gib mir das, wann du gibest,
Verlier' auch ich,

ist solchen von Ronsard nachgebildet, aber das dem französischen Dichter Besondere besteht darin, dass der Gedanke 'Pflücket die Rose eh sie verblüht' fast immer an die Aufforderung des Jünglings an das Mädchen, am frühen Morgen, wenn der Tau an den Gräsern hängt, in den Garten zu gehen und zu sehn, wieviel neue Knospen sich erschlossen haben, geknüpft ist: ein Zug, der auf Ronsards Vorliebe

¹ Die *Sesenheimer Gedichte von Goethe und Lenz* (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1905, S. 51—115), im Buchhandel vergriffen.

für den *Roman de la Rose* beruht und mit einigen Abzügen noch in Goethes *Zueignung* erscheint. Ich wähle ein einziges Gedicht heraus:

Mignonne, allons voir si la rose
Qui ce matin avoit desclose
Sa robe de pourpre au soleil
A point perdu ceste vesprée
Les plis de sa robe pourprée,
Et son teint au vostre pareil.

Las! voyez comme en peu d'espace,
Mignonne, elle a dessus la place,
Las! las! ses beautés laissé cheoir!
O vraiment marastre Nature,
Puis qu'une telle fleur ne dure
Que du matin jusques au soir!

Donc, si vous me croyez, mignonne,
Tandis que vostre âge fleuronne
En sa plus verte nouveauté,
Cueillez, cueillez vostre jeunesse:
Comme à ceste fleur, la vieillesse
Fera ternir vostre beauté.

Dieser Gedanke ist nun auch in dem Sonett enthalten, das Goethen die Anregung zu seinem Friederikenlied gegeben hat:

Mignonne, levez-vous, vous estes paresseuse,
Ja la gaye alouette au ciel a fredonné,
Et ja le rossignol doucement jargoné,
Dessus l'espine assis, sa complainte amoureuse.

Sus! debout! allons voir l'herbelette perleuse,
Et vostre beau rosier de boutons couronné,
Et vos œillets aimés auxquels aviez donné
Hier au soir de l'eau d'une main si soigneuse.

Harsoir en vous couchant vous jurastes vos yeux
D'estre plustot que moy ce matin esveillée;
Mais le dormir de l'aube, aux filles gracieux,

Vous tient d'un doux sommeil encor les yeux sillée.
Ça ça, que je les baise, et vostre beau tetin,
Cent fois, pour vous apprendre à vous lever matin,

während ein anderes das Versmass hergab und weitere Züge lieferte:

Le jour pousse la nuit,
Et la nuit sombre
Pousse le jour qui luit
D'une obscure ombre.

L'automne suit l'esté,
Et l'aspre rage
Des vents n'a point esté
Après l'orage.

Mais la fièvre d'amours
Qui me tourmente
Demeure en moy toujours
Et ne s'alente.

Redonne la clarté
 A mes tenebres,
 Remets en liberté
 Mes jours funebres.

Amour, sois le support
 De ma pensée,
 Et guide à meilleur port
 Ma nef cassée.

Ne ma palle couleur,
 D'amour blesmie,
 N'a esmeu à douleur
 Mon ennemie.....

Aber Goethe hat die Verse 5—8 des Sonetts bis auf den Anfang ganz beiseitegelassen, das Übrige, z. T. weiter ausgeführt, auf seine drei ersten Strophen verteilt, drei fernere hinzugefügt, und am Schluss den Schlussgedanken des Sonetts, gehörig geändert, angefügt:

- Erwache, Friedericke,
 Vertreib die Nacht
 Die einer Deiner Blicke
 Zum Tage macht.
 5 Der Vögel sanft Geflüster
 Ruft liebevoll,
 Dass mein geliebt Geschwister
 Erwachen soll.
 Ist Dir Dein Wort nicht heilig
 10 Und meine Ruh?
 Erwache! Unverzeiglich!
 Noch schlummerst Du!
 Horch, Philomelens Kummer
 Schweigt heute still,
 15 Weil Dich der böse Schlummer
 Nicht meiden will.
 Es zittert Morgenschimmer
 Mit blödem Licht
 Errötend durch Dein Zimmer
 20 Und weckt Dich nicht.
 Am Busen Deiner Schwester,
 Der für Dich schlägt,
 Entschläfst Du immer fester
 Je mehr es tagt.

Die ersten beiden Verse sind oben in den französischen Texten enthalten, 'Mignonne, levez-vous' und 'pousse la nuit.' Der dritte und vierte, in dem 'Redonne la clarté / A mes tenebres' vorgezeichnet, bieten eine allen Literaturen bekannte Wendung, obwohl sie gewöhnlich dahin geht, dass die Blicke des Mädchens andere Sterne überstrahlen. In einem zweiten Sonett Ronsards hat man beide Wendungen zusammen, nur dass an der zweiten Stelle nicht Nacht und Tag, sondern Winter und Sommer sich gegenübergestellt sind:

Je vey ma nymphe entre cent damoiselles,
Comme un croissant par les menus flambeaux,
Et de ses yeux, plus que les astres beaux
Faire obscurcir la beauté des plus belles....

Si qu'en despit de l'hyver froidureux,
Par la vertu de ses yeux amoureux
Un beau printemps s'engendra de sa face.

Oft hört man statt 'einer Deiner Blicke' zitieren 'jeder...' Diese Verbindung findet sich in Hagedorns Gedicht *Der Wink* (*Poetische Werke*, Bern, 1772, Bd. 4, 147), dessen Anfang übrigens dem Anfang unserer zweiten Strophe anklingt:

Ist gleich dein Wink verstohlen:
So find ich doch mein glücke
In jedem deiner blicke,
Der meine Hoffnung nährt.

Auch in Ramlers *Blumenlese* (1, 143) steht so ein Gedicht, *An die Nachtigall* überschrieben, wo die letzte Strophe lautet:

Dann kehre sie von Sehnsucht matt zurücke;
Noch nie gefühlte Glut durchwall' ihr junges Herz,
Sie lächle Zärtlichkeit aus jedem ihrer Blicke,
Und lindre meiner Liebe Schmerz.

Die Nachtigall soll die Geliebte herbeirufen, ihrem Liede zu lauschen! Aber 'einer' ist mit vollem Bedacht gesagt, was durch ein ferneres Sonett Ronsards veranlasst sein wird ('Pren ceste rose...'):

La rose et moy differons d'une chose;
Un soleil void naistre e mourir la rose;
Mille soleils ont vu naistre m'amour,
Dont l'action jamais ne se repose.
Ha! plut à Dieu que telle amour, éclose
Comme une fleur, ne m'eust duré qu'un jour!

Schliesslich noch eine Strophe als Zugabe:

L'honneur du ciel, est-ce pas ceste flame
Qui donne aux dieux et lumière et chaleur?
Ton ornament, est-ce pas la valeur
De son bel œuil, qui tout le monde enflame?

Vers 5 nennt die Vögel, die ihr Morgenlied anstimmen, nicht mit Namen wie das erste Sonett Ronsards und Hagedorns Gedicht *Der Morgen* (4, 191), das schon von andern dem Friederikenlied verglichen worden ist:

Uns lockt die morgenröthe
In busch und wald,
Wo schon der hirtens flöte
Ins land erschallt.
Die lerche steigt und schwirret,
Von lust erregt;
Die taube lacht und girret,
Die wachtel schlägt....

Zwei Friederikenlieder

Der schmelz der grünen flächen
 Glänzt voller pracht,
 Und von den klaren bächen
 Entweicht die nacht.....

Im Sonett 'Mignonne, levez-vous' hörten wir, worauf sich die Worte in Vers 9 beziehen: Das Mädchen hatte versprochen, frühzeitig zu dem Geliebten in den Garten oder in die Laube zu kommen. In Götzens Lied *An die Laura* erscheint dasselbe Motiv:

Der schwühle Tag hat sich verloren,
 Die Nacht ist hier:
 O Laura! was dein Mund geschworen,
 Das halte mir.
 Sieh jenes Dach von Rebenblättern,
 Wo niemand lauscht,
 Wo du mit mir, vor allen Göttern,
 Dein Herz vertauscht....

Selbst die Schauerromanze *Lykas und Myrrha* von Eschenburg, beginnend

Es war schon tiefe Mitternacht
 In welcher fest des Schlafes Macht
 Die Augenlieder band

vgl. Ronsard: 'le dormir de l'aube...vous tient d'un doux sommeil encor les yeux sillée'—mag herbeigeht werden: Bietet sie in den ersten sechs Strophen überhaupt zahlreiche Bilder, die uns bisher begegnet sind, so fängt die sechste an:

Erwache!—rief sie—sieh mich hier,
 Die treue Myrrha, die vor dir
 Enteilt dem Grabe steht!

und die achte:

Denk, Lykas, wenn du nun erwachst,
 An das, was schwörend du versprachst,
 An mir verheissnes Glück!

Bei Ronsard hiess es doch: 'D'estre plustot que moy...esveillé,' und Goethes Zusatz 'Und meine Ruh,' der natürlich jetzt nichts anderes bedeutet als: 'Ich bin umsonst so früh aus den Federn gekrochen,' mag noch immer leise an die ruhelose Tote erinnern, die den wortbrüchigen Knaben wecken will. Ich weiss übrigens, das 'vor dir' in Wirklichkeit nicht zu 'enteilt dem Grabe,' sondern zu 'steht' gehört.

Die Verse 9—20 sind in ihren wesentlichen Zügen oben schon belegt. Als eigne Erfindung des Dichters könnte der in 21 f. erscheinende Zug angesprochen werden: Friederike wird, vorab wenn Besuch da war, mit einer der Schwestern zusammengeschlafen haben.

Aber bei Ronsard hiess es: 'le dormir de l'aube, aux filles gracieux,' in Hölty's Gedicht *Auf den Tod einer Nachtigall*:

Da lauschete, da, da ward das Entzücken
 Der Liebe laut,
 Und schmachkend hieng an ihres Liebings Blicken
 Die junge Braut;
 Sie drückten sich, bey jeder deiner Fugen,
 Die Hand einmal,
 Und hörten nicht, wenn deine Schwestern schlugen,
 O Nachtigall!

und in einem neuen Sonett Ronsards, von Goethe zum Theil fast übersetzt:

Cache pour ceste nuit ta corne, bonne lune;
 Ainsi Endymion soit tousjours ton amy,
 Et, sans se réveiller, en ton sein endormy,
 Ainsi nul enchanteur jamais ne t'importune.

Zwei Gedichte Günthers—es sind die beiden letzten der Sammlung von 1742, S. 1175 bis 1178—sollen uns zu der zweiten Hälfte des Friederikenlieds hinüberführen. Das zweite davon, *Der verliebte Kummer*, ähnelt auch in der äusseren Situation:

Die Liebe weckt an diesen Morgen
 Den Kummer der verliebten Sorgen
 Mit mir gar zeitig wieder auf,
 Die Seuffzer wachen in dem Munde,
 Die Thränen suchen aus dem Grunde
 Des Hertzens ihren alten Lauf.

Die Schmiedin meiner süssen Kette
 Zieht meine Faulheit aus dem Bette,
 In welchem sie der Schlaff noch wiegt.
 Ihr Auge schläfft, ich aber weine,
 Die Einsamkeit sitzt auf dem Steine,
 Der mir an meinem Herzen liegt.

Ach! denck ich, bringt dies nahe Scheiden
 Von ihrer Brust ein solches Leiden,
 Da nur ein Zimmer uns zertrennt;
 Wer wird doch meine Wunden heilen,
 Wenn Land und Luft uns einmal theilen,
 Und Schweidnitz mir kein Brod mehr gönnt?

Die Zähren mühn sich, meine Klagen
 Mit stummer Sprache nach zu sagen,
 Allein die Angst vertrocknet sie.
 Ach! wem vertrau ich diesen Jammer?
 Der freyen Luft, der tauben Kammer?
 Und beydes ist vergebne Müh'....

Sehr oft erscheint in den anakreontischen Gedichten der Gedanke, dass der Liebende des Mädchens Schlummer nicht stören wolle. Gerstenberg beginnt sein Lied *Das schlafende Mädchen*—schon Minor und

Sauer, *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie*, S. 33, machen darauf aufmerksam —mit den Worten:

Schlummre, schlummre sanft, o Schöne!
Stöhrst sie nicht, der Nachtigallen Töne!

Aber bei Goethe sieht der Liebhaber sein Mädchen nur im Geiste vor sich, und so kann er auch nicht genau so singen wie einer bei Ronsard ('Douce Maistresse, touche...'):

Maistresse, je n'ay garde
De vouloir t'éveiller,
Heureux quand je regarde
Tes beaux yeux sommeiller....

Ebensowenig träumt er sich wieder als weitverschlagenen Ritter neben Luna, um von dort herab in die Kammer zu schauen; aber er erinnert sich doch, dass er dies einst getan hatte:

Dämmerung wo die Wollust thront,
Schwimmt um ihre runden Glieder.
Trunken sinkt mein Blick hernieder.
Was verhüllt man wohl dem Mond.
Doch, was das für Wünsche sind!
Voll Begierde, zu genießen,
So da droben hängen müssen;
Ey da schieltest du dich blind.

und damit vielleicht auch an die Romanze *Damon und Ismene* von Gleim, wo die Worte vorkamen:

Er gieng in jene Fernen,
Ihn deckt kein Grab;
Er wandelt unter Sternen,
Und sieht herab!...
Freund, sprach er, meine Schöne
Find ich einst dort....

und der Anfang lautete:

Ach Damon, ach Ismene!
Mein Herz ist weich!
Ach welche heisse Thräne
Wein ich um euch....

während ihm die ganze Strophe 4 durch die zweite eines Ronsard'schen Sonetts disponiert wurde ('Quand l'esté...')

Personne ne te void qui d'une couleur fade,
Ne retourne au logis ou malade ou pasmé,
Qu'il ne sente d'amour tout son cœur entamé,
Ou ne soit esbloüy des rais de ton œuillade.

Morris will wieder ohne Bedenken von dem handschriftlichen 'fehllos' zu dem falschen 'fühllos' der Drucke zurückkehren, Schröder verweist, um jenes zu halten, auf eine Stelle in dem freilich erst 1798

entstandenen *Blümchen Wunderschön*, wo sich der Ritter 'frei von bösen Fehlen' nenne. Aber in diesem Sinne würde es eine schon vorhandene Eigenschaft bedeuten, und der Gegensatz zu 'Und wär er...von Eis' wäre nicht ganz rein. Man erwartet die Bedeutung: 'ohne einen Fehler, einen Schaden davonzutragen.' Goethe wollte offenbar die Worte 'Personne ne te void qui...ne retourne ou malade ou pasmé' möglichst ähnlich wiedergeben, und das ist ihm aufs beste gelungen: 'fehllos' umfasst die beiden Begriffe 'malade' und 'pasmé,' indem es den gemeinsamen Komponenten eliminiert. Unter dies 'fehllos' subsummiert man das vorhergehende 'blind' und das folgende 'heiss,' wie es ja auch im französischen Text hiess: 'qu'il...ne soit esbloüy,' und vor allem in der vorhergehenden Strophe:

Quand l'esté dans ton lit tu te couches malade,
Couverte d'un linceul de roses tout semé,
Amour, d'arc et de trousse et de fleches armé,
Caché sous ton chevet se tient en embuscade:

Amor bringt dem Neugierigen die Verletzung' bei. Man wird ja wohl nicht das folgende 'Qu'il ne sente' zugunsten des 'fehllos' unterstreichen: Hier folgt ein Objekt, 'pasmé' und 'malade' sind wie 'fehllos' absolut gebrauchte Adjektiva.

- 25 Ich seh Dich schlummern, Schöne,
Vom Auge rinnt
Mir eine süsse Träne
Und macht mich blind.
Wer kann es fehllos sehen
30 Wer wird nicht heiss—
Und wär er von den Zähnen
Zum Kopf von Eiss!
Vielleicht erscheint Dir träumend—
O Glück!—mein Bild,
35 Das halb im Schlaf und reimend
Die Musen schilt.
Erröthen und erblassen
Sieh sein Gesicht:
Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen,
40 Doch wacht er nicht.
Die Nachtigall im Schläfe
Hast Du versäumt:
So höre nun zur Strafe
Was ich gereimt.
45 Schwer lag auf meinem Busen
Des Reimes Joch:
Die schönste meiner Musen,
Du—schliefst ja noch.

An dem forcierten Bilde Vers 31 f. hat man oft Anstoss genommen. Ich erinnere dazu an die dritte Strophe in dem oben zitierten Gedicht von Opitz:

Der Wangen Zier verbleichet,
 Das Haar wird greis,
 Der Augen Feuer weicht,
 Die Brunst wird Eis.

ferner an Kleists *Lied eines Lappländers* (*Werke*, Amsterdam 1765, Bd. 1, 70), das Goethe, wie 'Ich denke dein' beweist, genau kannte:

Komm, Zama, komm! Lass deinen Unmuth fahren,
 O du, der Preis
 Der Schönen! Komm! In den zerstörten Haaren
 Hängt mir schon Eis....
 Und solltest du, weit übers Meer, in Wüsten
 Verborg'n seyn:
 So will ich bald an Gröndlands weissen Küsten
 Nach Zama schreyn....

und das wie *Es schlug mein Herz* mit den Worten 'welch ein Glück!' schliesst. Diese gewaltsamen, elementaren Bilder finden sich auch in einem Sonett Ronsards:

Or' que le Ciel, or' que la terre est pleine
 De glas, de gresle éparse en tous endroits,
 Et que l'horreur des plus froids mois
 Fait herisser les cheveux de la pleine:

Or' que le vent, qui mutin se promeîne,
 Rompt les rochers et desplante les bois,
 Et que la mer redoublant ses abois,
 Sa rage enflée aux rivages amène.

Amour me brusle, et l'Hyver froidureux
 Qui gele tout, de mon feu chaleureux
 Ne gele point l'ardeur, qui tousjours dure.

Voyez Amans comme je suis traité!
 Je meurs de froid au plus chaud de l'Esté,
 Et de chaleur au cœur de la froidure:

und noch stärker in Günthers vorletztem Gedicht, *Celine an ihren ungetreuen Selimor*, das Goethe gewiss deutlich vor Augen gestanden hat:

Fliest ihr wohl bedachten Zähren!
 Fliest ihr Zeugen meiner Pein!
 Wo sich Glück und Wind verkehren,
 Da verbleibt der Sonnenschein.
 Das Verhängniss, dessen Triebe
 Mich in Amors Garn gebracht,
 Setzt dem Himmel meiner Liebe
 Blut-Cometen in die Nacht....

Jeder Abend, jeder Morgen
 Höret mein beweglich Ach,
 Und das Heer der bleichen Sorgen
 Folgt mir in das Schlaf-Gemach.
 Meine Sehnsucht stirbt vor Kummer,
 Die betrogne Hoffnung weint,
 Wenn ihr ohngefahr im Schlummer
erscheint....

Selbst der Aufruhr von dem Blute,
 Ungetreuer Selimor!
 Rücket deinem Wankelmuth
 Den begangnen Meineyd vor,
 Dein entfärbtes Angesichte,
 Das sich vor ihm selber schämt,
 Zeigt, wie die verbotnen Früchte
 Dir bereits die Hand gelähmt.

Kehre wieder, falsche Seele!
 Eh dein Wechsel meinen Geist
 Aus des Leibes Marter-Höhle
 In die Ewigkeit verweist;
 Prüfe nur das reine Feuer,
 So durch meine Glieder laufft!
 Es brennt warlich nicht auf heuer,
 Sondern bis der Nil ersauft...

Hier erscheint auch das beliebte anakreontische Motiv, das uns Strophe 5 des Friederikenliedes bietet. Aus einem guten Schock von Beispielen, die ich mir von Weckherlin bis Bürger notiert habe, seien die nächstgelegenen ausgewählt, die unter sich wieder enger zusammengehören. Bürgers Lied *An den Traum*, im Herbst 1771 gedruckt, entstand ungefähr um dieselbe Zeit wie unser Gedicht und ist auch im Versmass verwandt. War es durch Wallers¹ *Say lovely dream* angeregt, so hat es doch auch von Günthers *Aria zu einer Abend-music* (S. 279) manches profitiert, deren Spuren wiederum in Hagedorns Goethen so gut bekanntem Gedicht *Die Alster* zu beobachten waren ('Beförderer vieler Lustbarkeiten...' 4, 204):

Befördert ihr gelinden Saiten
 Den sanftten Schlummer süsser Ruh!
 Rhodante legt die müden Glieder,
 Der Arm wird schwach, das Haupt sinkt nieder,
 Und schlägt die holden Augen zu.
 Ihr angenehmen Nacht-Betrieger,
 Ihr süssen Träume, schleicht herein....
 Ergetzt sie mit den schönsten Bildern,
 Die Schertz und Lieb erdichten kann....

Schon dies Gedicht haben wir auch dem unsern zu vergleichen. Ein anderes von Günther, *Schreiben an seine Magdalis* (629), bot die besondere Wendung, die in Goethes Versen 35 f., 44 ff. genommen wird, und dazu ein Wort in Vers 46:

Die Erde schläfft und ruht, ich aber wach' und träume,
 Weil deine Liebe mich mit offnen Augen wiegt.
 Ich schreib und weiss nicht was: Du siehst es aus dem Reime,
 Der nuß aus Schweidnitz kommt und lahme Füsse kriegt.

¹ Bezeichnenderweise sagen alle Herausgeber: 'Walkers,' der eine schreibt vom andern ab, und keiner sucht das Gedicht einmal selbst auf.

Das Joch der Einsamkeit schlägt meinen Leib darnieder,
 Dem Nacht und Finsterniss die müde Seite schleusst:
 Die ungewohnte Streu fühlt selbst den Schmerz der Glieder,
 Die ein verborgnes Weh von ihrem Lager reisst....

Schliesslich noch ein paar Verse aus Gleims Gedicht *An den Schlaf,*
auf der Doris Nachttisch gelegt:

Dann so lass der Schönen auf mein Flehen,
 Bald im Traum doch dessen Bildniss sehen,
 Der nach ihr schon tausend Seufzer schickt....

Der Anschluss an solche Vorbilder hat hier aber nicht wie so oft zu Inkongruenzen in Goethes Strophen geführt.

Auch in den anakreontischen Gedichten sollte das 'Bild' häufig blass oder bleich erscheinen: doch nur, damit diese Jammergestalt die Schläferin rühre und sie endlich Erhörung gewähre. In Günthers Gedicht dagegen ist das 'entfärbte Angesicht' Ausdruck der Scham und der Reue:

Selbst der Aufruhr von dem Blute,
 Ungetreuer Selimor!
 Rücket deinem Wankelmuth
 Den begangnen Meineyd vor.
 Dein entfärbtes Angesichte,
 Das sich vor ihm selber schämt,
 Zeigt, wie die verbotnen Früchte
 Dir bereits die Hand gelähmt....

Mutatis mutandis, hat man in unserer fünften Strophe in dem 'Erröthen und erblassen' die in Scham und Ärger wechselnde Stimmung des Dichtenden zu verstehen, dem die Geliebte ihr Wort gebrochen hat (vgl. Vers 9). Aber dies ist nicht die unmittelbare Ursache dazu. Auch die auf das Kolon (Vers 38) folgenden Verse 38 f. bieten diese Ursache nicht direkt, sondern erst einmal den Grund für denjenigen Umstand, der sie im Gefolge gehabt hat: Zwar ist der Mann wach, aber der Dichter, der volle Gebrauch seiner dichterischen Kräfte ist nicht zugleich aufgewacht. 'Ich wache, aber mein Herz schläft': das Gegenteil des biblischen Worts. Dies Manko, behauptet er, dies nicht völlige Wachsein habe ihm das Reimen schwer gemacht, und das ist der Grund, warum er sich schämt und ärgerlich ist, errötet und erbleicht. Wie anders, wenn sie ihr Wort gehalten hätte und bei ihm wäre, die 'schönste seiner Musen,' die ihm die Gabe mühelosen poetischen Gestaltens bringt! Das war es ja doch, was alle Leute am jungen Goethe bestaunten und rühmten.

Je veux Muses aux beaux yeux,
 Muses mignonnes des dieux,
 D'un vers qui coule sans peine
 Louanger une fontaine.

Sus donc, Muses aux beaux yeux,
 Muses mignonnes des dieux,
 D'un vers qui coule sans peine,
 Louangeons une fontaine,
 C'est à vous de me guider,
 Sans vous je ne puis m'aider,
 Sans vous, Brunettes, ma lyre
 Rien de bon ne sauroit dire,

begann Ronsard eine seiner Oden, 'Muses mignonnes!' Und in Hagedorns Gedicht *An den verlohrnen Schlaf* (4, 105):

Mein alter freund, mein schlaf, erscheine wieder!
 Wie wünsch ich dich!
 Du sohn der nacht, o breite dein gefieder
 Auch über mich;
 Verlass dafür den wuchrer, ihn zu strafen,
 Den trug ergötzt:
 Hingegen lass den wachen Codrus schlafen,
 Der immer reimt und immer übersetzt,

ist es zwar nicht so ganz sicher, ob mit dem Codrus der Dichter einen Rivalen—vgl. Vergil, *Ecolg.* 5, 11—oder sich selbst gemeint hatte: aber Goethe wird Selbstironie darin empfunden haben. Auch für die Voranstellung der Apposition, 'Die schönste meiner Musen, Du schliefst,' zeigt sich hier das Vorbild: 'Mein alter Freund, mein Schlaf, erscheine....' Vgl. auch oben S. 453: 'Die Schmiedin meiner süssen Kette.'

Ronsards Sonett begann: 'Mignonne, levez-vous, vous estes paresseuse,' und endete: 'pour vous apprendre à vous lever matin.' In solchen kleinen Rahmen hat auch Goethe sein Gedicht eingeschlossen. Daraus ergibt sich in den letzten beiden Strophen ein etwas künstlicher Chiasmus: 35 f. × 47 f., 37 f. × 45 f., 39 f. × 43 f. Sehr hübsch aber bindet der heitere Gegensatz, der zu 43 f. eingefügt ist—'Was ich gereimt: Die Nachtigall'—den Schluss an den Anfang des Gedichts.

Wenn man wie Maurer und Morris empfindet, mag man ein Dutzend Kombinationen mit einer bis sechs Strophen herstellen und an jeder seinen Spass haben: wir andern kennen nur eine Gestalt des Gedichts, die von Goethe selbst ist, und aus der wir nicht einen einzigen Vers abgeben wollen¹. Man denke sich doch einmal die Strophen 2, 4, 5 weg.

¹ Man wird nicht verlangen, dass ich auf bare Redensarten eingehe (Maurer 25): 'In der Tat (Str. 1, 3, 6) ein Gedicht, in dem nichts Wesentliches vermisst wird, ein Gedicht, das des apollinischen Dichterjünglings würdig ist. Dieser frische, bei aller Weichheit starke Ton, diese gesunde, hoffnungsfrohe Grundfarbe. Wo (Str. 2) blieb (!) das schlicht-schöne Ethos, das die Goetheschen Verse adelt, der liedartige Charakter des Ganzen? Hier finden wir nervös aufgeregte, übertreibende Deklamation, rhetorische Mittel, wie Fragen und Ausrufe, und infolgedessen einen zerhackten Rhythmus. Das ist ein völlig anderes Genus von Dichtung. Dort die Verschwisterung mit der Musik, hier mit der Beredsamkeit (!). Es kann kein Zweifel sein: der Abschreiber Lenz ist zu Wort gekommen' u. dergl. Zeugs mehr.

Wie sollte der junge Mann dazu kommen, die Schläferin schon vor Tage aus dem Bett zu trommeln, und ihr zu zürnen, dass sie nicht erwachen wolle: wenn sie ihm nicht versprochen hätte, ihn im Garten zu treffen! Ich sehe von der engen Verbindung, die durch die französische Quelle zwischen den ersten zwei Strophen hergestellt wird, ganz ab. Und würde anderseits Strophe 6 wirklich passen, wenn nicht Strr. 4 und 5 voraus-, und zwar unmittelbar vorausgegangen wären? Passen auf Maurers 'von schlicht-schönem Ethos geadelte liederartige' Strophen die Worte: 'So höre nun zur Strafe / Was ich gereimt / Schwer lag auf meinem Busen / Des Reimes Joch'? In seinem Sinne jedenfalls nicht, und in unserem nicht in dem Umfange, dass die andern Strophen zu entbehren wären.

Offenbar haben Maurer, Morris und W. A. 5, II 216 dies in eben dem Grade selbstironische wie für Friederike schmeichelhafte Gedicht gar nicht verstanden, haben den Wald vor Bäumen nicht gesehen. Und auch Schröders, wie ich schon aus den dürftigen Auszügen bei Maurer sehe, an sich völlig zutreffende Ausführungen über die Reime sind bei diesem Gedicht nicht ganz am Ort: Der Dichter spottet ja doch selbst über seine Reime. Ich weiss nicht, ob nicht schon lautlich 'Friedericke': 'Blicke' anstössig war, aber den Reim 'schlagt': 'tagt,' macht er sicherlich nur mit Humor: Reim dich oder ich fress dich. Doch das sind ein oder zwei schlechte Reime. Erst die nächsten Strophen machen das Gedicht zu einer Strafe dafür, dass Friederike nicht der Nachtigall gelauscht hat: 'Schöne': 'Träne,' 'rinnt': 'blind,' 'sehen': 'Zähen' (absichtlich!), 'heiss': 'Eiss' sind zum Teil lautlich schlecht, zum Teil trivial im höchsten Grade. Gellert (*Werke*, Leipzig, 1784, Bd. 1, 316) hatte einmal ähnliches Geschreibsel kritisiert und dabei verlangt: 'Der Reim ist der Sklave, und der Poet der Herr. La Rime est une esclave, et ne doit qu'obéir.' Auch in Goethes Gedicht ist es umgekehrt, ist der Reim der Herr, und der Dichter der Sklave.

Wie in aller Welt käme er hier zu seiner Träne, wenn er nicht auf Schöne reimen wollte, und umgekehrt. Auch dass er seine eigne Träne wie Günther die Kette süß nennt, ist doch reine Ironie, er nimmt von der Anakreontik Abschied. Und nachher, in der sechsten Strophe selbst, bringt er den abgedroschenen Reim 'Busen': 'Musen'! Die Reime der vierten Strophe sind geradezu unentbehrliche Voraussetzung für den Inhalt von Strophe 6. Und Strophe 5, inhaltlich in ergötzlichem Gegensatz zur vorhergehenden stehend, bildet die Brücke: Erst sieht er sie, das süsse Geschöpf, wie es in strammer Gesundheit, in kerngesundem Ganzschlummer daliegt; und dann soll sie ihn sehen: 'O Glück,'

d. h. Es wäre wirklich zu wünschen, dass Dir die Jammergestalt vor Augen trete!

Das lustige Geschäft, sich auszudenken, wie das Erlebnis zugestandegewonnen ist, dem die Sesenheimer Muse die hübsche Gabe verdanken sollte, bleibt unserer Phantasie überlassen.

II.

‘DEM HIMMEL WACHS ENTGEGEN...’

In dem oben herangezogenen Gedichte von Günther, *Der verliebte Kummer*, fängt die sechste Strophe an:

Schnitt ich mein Elend in die Linden,
Erzehlt ich es den sanften Winden,
So seh ich überall Gefahr....

Die Sitte, Namen oder Verse in die Rinde eines Baumes einzuschneiden, übten schon die Alten. Ich gebe nur aus ihrer Literatur ein paar Beispiele.

In der ersten Ekloge des Calpurnius Siculus ist ein Gedicht von nicht weniger als 56 Zeilen (33—88) eingeschaltet, das in einen Baum geschnitten ist!

Virgil, *Ekl.*, 5, 13 sind es ebenfalls ‘Carmina’:

Immo haec, in viridi nuper quae cortice fagi
Carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi,
Experiar....

Ebendort 10, 53 ‘amores’:

Certum est in silvis, inter spelaea ferarum
Malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
Arboribus; crescent illae, crescetis amores.

Bei Properz 1, 18 ‘amores’:

Vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores,
Fagus, et Arcadio pinus amica Deo.
Ah, quoties teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras,
Scribitur et vestris *Cynthia* corticibus!

In der *Anthologia latina*, I 248 ‘nomen’:

Quando ponebam novellas arbores mali et piri,
Cortici summae notavi nomen ardoris mei;
Nulla fuit exinde finis vel quies cupidinis:
Crescit arbor, gliscit ardor, ramus implet litteras.

Eine besondere Wendung bei Theokrit, *Id.*, 18:

Γράμματα δ' ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράφεται (ὡς παριών τις
'Αννείμῃ) Δωριστί· ΣΕΒΟΥ Μ'. ΕΛΕΝΑΣ ΦΥΤΟΝ ΕΙΜΙ.

Zu den Goethe am besten bekannten klassischen Werken gehören Ovids *Heroiden*. Da steht in Oenone's Brief an ihren ungetreuen Knaben Paris (5, 21 ff.) der folgende Passus:

Incisae servant a te mea nomina fagi:
 Et legor *Oenone*, falce notata, tua:
 Et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt:
 Crescite, et in titulos surgite recta meos.
 Populus est (memini) fluviali consita ripa,
 Est in qua nostri litera scripta memor.
 Popule, vive precor, quae consita margine ripae,
 Hoc in rugoso cortice carmen habes:
 Cum Paris Oenone poterit spirare relicta,
 Ad fontem Xanthi versa recurret aqua....

Vers 3 erinnert hier an Hagedorn, *Unverdiente Eifersucht* (4, 100):

Name, wachse mit den rinden!
 Wachse, denkmal meiner hand!

Das Ganze aber an die letzte Strophe eines in Ramlers *Blumenlese* (1, 97) stehenden anakreontischen Gedichts, *Das ungetreue Mädchen*:

Sie grub in eine Rinde
 Mit eignen Händen ein:
 Wer untreu wird, der finde
 Sein Grab in diesem Hain.
 Schont, Götter, schont Ismenen,
 Die selbst ihr Urtheil spricht;
 Mein Tod soll euch versöhnen,
 Straft nur Ismenen nicht!

Dieser letztere Gedanke findet sich nun auch in der zweiten Hälfte von Goethes Epigramm:

Dem Himmel wach's entgögen
 Der Baum, der Erde Stolz!
 Ihr Wetter, Stürm' und Regen,
 Verschont das heil'ge Holz!
 Und soll ein Name verderben,
 So nehmt die obern in Acht!
 Es mag der Dichter sterben,
 Der diesen Reim gemacht!

während die erste, worauf Minor und Sauer (a. a. O. 39) hinweisen, sich an Verse Cronegks anschliessen (Lpzg, 1771: 2, 39. 327. DjG², 6, 160):

Kein Nordwind und kein Sturm
 Zerstöhr das heilge Grün.
 Verzeih, o Baum, wenn deine heiligen Rinden
 Die Hand verletzt, die Chloens Namen schreibt!
 Es schützet dich vor den erzürnten Winden...
 Des Himmels Blitz trifft deine Scheitel nie.

Den Brauch, der Geliebten Namen in die Rinde einzugraben, hatte Goethe schon in Leipzig geübt. Hier aber trat ein neuer Zug hinzu: Nach der Überlieferung soll er (W. A. 5, II 221) unsern Spruch auf

eine an einer Buche befestigte Tafel unter die Namen der Familie Brion und 'vieler guter Freunde' geschrieben haben. Diesen Zug bietet nun wieder das folgende, von gewissen antiken Mustern (s. oben) beeinflusste Sonett Ronsards:

Je plante, en ta faveur cet arbre de Cybelle,
Ce pin, où tes honneurs se liront tous les jours:
J'ai gravé sur le tronc nos noms et nos amours,
Qui croîtront à l'envy de l'écorce nouvelle.
Faunes, qui habitez ma terre paternelle,
Qui menez sur le Loir vos danses et vos tours,
Favorisez la plante et lui donnez secours,
Que l'esté ne la brusle et l'hiver ne la gelle.
Pasteur qui conduiras en ce lieu ton troupeau,
Flageollant une eclogue en ton tuyau d'aveine,
Attache tous les ans à cest arbre un tableau
Qui tesmoigne aux passans mes amours et ma peine.
Puis, l'arrosant de lait et du sang d'un agneau,
Dy: 'Ce pin est sacré, c'est la plante d'Helene.'

Aus einem andern ist die Wendung 'Dem Himmel wachs' entgegen' übersetzt:

Afin que ton honneur coule parmi la plaine
Autant qu'il monte au ciel engravé dans un pin,
Invoquant tous les dieux et respondant du vin,
Je consacre à ton nom ceste belle fontaine....

Natürlich ist nicht daran zu denken, dass die Namen alle auf der Tafel gestanden haben (W. A. 5, II 221 f. gegen Minor und Sauer 40): Sie waren, Goethes Name dabei zu unterst, in der Baum geschnitten, und darunter die Tafel mit dem Epigramm angebracht. Eher noch möchte ich glauben, dass Goethes Name unter dem Gedicht mit auf der Tafel gestanden habe, die eben gegenüber dem Stamm das Vergängliche war: Die Natur macht keine Unterschiede bei den in den Stamm geschnittenen Lettern, aber die Tafel soll der Hirt bei Ronsard alle Jahre erneuern.

Bei Gelegenheit sollen auch die andern Friederikenlieder noch besprochen, soll weiter gezeigt werden, auf welche Art Goethe mit Ronsard bekannt geworden war. Auch in späterer Zeit lassen sich Spuren der Ronsardlektüre nachweisen. Solche aus dem Jahre 1805 z. B. hatte ich schon aufgefunden, bevor ich aus Weimar hörte, dass Goethe vom 5. März bis 25. April 'Ronsard, *Oeuvres*' von der Bibliothek entliehen hat. Den Anlass zu dieser Arbeit verdanke ich einem Winke der Goethekennerin Fräulein Antonie Meyer, Schwester von Eduard und Kuno Meyer: Schon die erste schnelle Durchsicht von Ronsards Werken lieferte mir dann die Gedichte, die in Betracht kamen.

G. SCHAAFFS.

ST ANDREWS.

THE PROLOGUE TO CHAUCER'S 'LEGEND OF GOOD WOMEN' IN RELATION TO QUEEN ANNE AND RICHARD.

OF the many problems presented to us in the *Legend of Good Women*, one of the most interesting, and at the same time one of the most illusive, is that of the relation of Alceste to Queen Anne in Prologue B. From the publication of Ten Brink's *Studien* in 1870 to the publication of Mr Lowes's article in 1904, the theory of an allegorical identification was universally accepted¹. Mr Lowes, however, opposed the identification of Anne and Alceste. His objections to it were supplemented by the argument Professor G. L. Kittredge made against the identification in 1909². Meanwhile, however, in 1907, Mr Lowes's position had been challenged by Mr Tatlock, who attempted, as he said, 'the rehabilitation and extension of the old and orthodox theory of a personal compliment to the queen' paid through Prologue B, and removed from A³.

Tatlock's argument is without question the strongest that has been made in favour of the identification of Alceste and Queen Anne, and deserves careful consideration. Stated briefly it is somewhat as follows. (1) That some living woman is symbolised by the daisy and Alceste in B is to be inferred from the use of the pronouns 'she' and 'her' in referring to the flower, and from the warmth of personal devotion expressed by the poet in his treatment of the daisy. (2) The French and Italian poems that served as Chaucer's models are known to have been addressed to real ladies; are we to believe that Chaucer, although he surpassed his originals in warmth of speech, had in mind no one more real than a heroine of Greek myth? (3) That he should have

¹ Mr Lowes's article is printed in *Publications of the Modern Lang. Ass. of America*, xix, 593 ff. His note on page 666 gives a convenient list of references to previous opinions on this question. Tatlock, in his *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 103, gives some additional references.

² *Modern Philology*, vi, 435 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 102. The connection of the *Legend* with the queen is treated in pp. 102—120.

intended Alceste to symbolise Queen Anne in the B Prologue is not surprising, considering that the queen, in all probability, dictated to Chaucer the subject of the poem, and that Chaucer dedicated it to her. (4) Finally, the theory of an identification of Alceste and the queen in B accounts more satisfactorily than any other for the peculiarities of revision presented in A¹.

The limitations of space make it impossible to consider all of these arguments in detail, but it could easily be shown that Mr Tatlock's first, second, and fourth arguments are very far from conclusive². It is in his third argument that the real strength of his position consists. Even if we disallow the assumption that the *Legend* was written at the queen's command (an assumption for which there is, after all, very little

¹ Since my own article is not at all concerned with *proving* that the B Prologue is the original version and that A is the revision, I shall take this hypothesis for granted in what follows. The arguments that have been presented in favour of this opinion by Mr Lowes and Mr Tatlock are, as it seems to me, ample justification for this course.

² Tatlock's first and second arguments were very satisfactorily met (in anticipation of such objections) by Lowes, *l.c.*, pp. 670—674. His fourth argument cannot receive adequate consideration within the limits of a foot-note, and I shall have to content myself with indicating its inconclusiveness in the briefest possible manner. Tatlock, after comparing the two prologues (pp. 86—102) and showing in a very convincing manner that, from the structural point of view, A is notably superior to B, reserves for further discussion three difficulties: 'the abolition in version G of almost all the warm feeling, and with it many excellent passages; secondly, the giving up of the suspense as to who is the lady of the Balade, and the lady who comes with the God of Love; and thirdly, the fact that, although she is repeatedly named in G, Chaucer at the very end affects not to know who she is. Without the connection with the queen, all these I believe to be quite inexplicable; with it all seems clear' (p. 115). Now the decrease in warmth of feeling is the result, first of a number of minor changes, the omission or revision of a line or two here and there; and secondly, of the omission of B 84—96 and B 101—118. The minor changes need cause us no difficulty, for Chaucer could not have made the numerous and important structural changes which Tatlock shows him to have made, without sacrificing many details that were charming in themselves but did not fall in easily with the new plan. As to B 84—96, it is quite as satisfactory to assume that they referred originally to the daisy, and that Chaucer omitted them because they seemed a little extravagant, as it is to assume that they referred to Anne and that Chaucer omitted them because he wished to efface from the poem all traces of its original occasion. For the propriety of addressing such lines to the queen is as questionable as the propriety of addressing them to the daisy. Nor is the omission of B 101—118 made more intelligible by the assumption of an allegorical identification of Alceste and Anne. For when we compare the two versions at this point we see that these lines are a digression in B and that the insertion of A 85—88 in their place is actually an improvement. It is Tatlock's opinion (to take up the second difficulty that he would solve on the hypothesis that Alceste is a symbol for Anne) that in B Chaucer sings his balade, not in praise of Alceste, but in praise of Anne (p. 108), and that this explains the rebuke the God of Love administers to him in B 537—541. This is improbable in itself, and is inconsistent with B 241—248, 255, 270—281, which prove clearly that Chaucer sings the balade about the lady who enters with the God of Love, Alceste. As to the fact that Chaucer appears at the end not to know who Alceste is, this difficulty exists in both versions of the prologue, for in both B 432 and A 422 Alceste announces her identity in the presence of the poet: 'I, your Alceste, whylom quene of Trace.' It is in this line that the real difficulty lies, and not in A 179, 317. In dealing with this difficulty we are not in the least aided by assuming that Alceste is the queen. For Tatlock himself (pp. 119, 120) finds it necessary to assume that Chaucer's failure to know Alceste at the end, is a mere slip in B, which Chaucer forgot to remove in A. But this, surely, is begging the question.

evidence)¹ we know that Chaucer wrote the poem with the intention of presenting it to the queen when finished. The lines:

And whan this book is maad, yive hit the quene
On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene²,

make this perfectly certain. It is therefore not merely excusable, but eminently proper, that we should expect to find the poem, and especially the Prologue, adapted to the purpose of complimenting the queen who was to read it.

Now, as Professor W. A. Neilson has suggested to me, the choice of Alceste as the Queen of the God of Love is in itself evidence of Chaucer's adaptation of his material to the purpose of complimenting Queen Anne. Since the poem was to be presented to her, it was fitting that the place of highest honour in the Court of Love should be given to a heroine who had distinguished herself for the particular kind of virtue exemplified by the queen, namely, faithful and loving wifehood. Instead of Venus, or Iseult, Chaucer chose as the 'kalender'

To any woman that wol lover be³,

Alceste,

For she taughte al the craft of fyn lovinge,
And namely of wyfhood the livinge,
And alle the boundes that she oghte kepe⁴,
She that for hir husbonde chees to dye,
And eek to goon to helle, rather than he⁵.

This interpretation appears eminently probable, because we cannot attribute the choice of Alceste to convention⁶. On the contrary, it is quite counter to the courtly love tradition with which the *Legend* is so closely connected. Courtly love was extra-conjugal; its first law, as laid down by Andreas Capellanus, was: 'Causa coniugii ab amore non est excusatio recta⁷.' Here Chaucer departs from tradition, and from

¹ For Tatlock's argument in favour of this assumption see his pp. 111—114. The evidence he cites, however, is ambiguous. We may grant that if Chaucer wrote the *Legend* at the command of the queen, Lydgate might very well have known of the fact. On the other hand, if Chaucer did not do so, Lydgate was quite capable of guessing, on the basis of B 496, 497, that he did. If Chaucer utters his 'And, for to maken shortly is the beste' more often than he does in other works of the same length, we must remember that the writing of the legends involved a great amount of condensation, and must therefore have consumed an amount of time out of proportion to their actual length. Whatever force there may be in the argument based on Chaucer's expressions of haste and weariness, is more than offset by the difficulty of explaining why, if Chaucer was compelled to continue the *Legend* against his will, was he not obliged to finish it? and why, if he disliked it so much, did he take up the *Legend* again after the queen's death, when he was free from the obligation (if it ever existed) of completing the work?

² B 496, 497.

³ B 543.

⁴ B 544—546.

⁵ B 513, 514.

⁶ 'The function of Alcestis as the queen of the God of Love, as well as her transformation into a daisy, is original with Chaucer' (Neilson, *Origins and Sources of the Court of Love*, p. 145).

⁷ *De Amore*, ed. Trojel, Havniae, 1892, p. 310.

his own normal practice (witness the *Troilus*). Not only is Alceste the chief lady of the Court of Love, but she prescribes that Chaucer shall make a glorious Legend

Of Gode Wommen, maidenés and wyves,
That weren trewe in lovinge al hir lyves¹.

I think we can scarcely doubt that this emphasis on *wifely* virtue is the result of Chaucer's adaptation of the love vision to the purpose of complimenting the queen.

If we accept this suggestion there is no need to assume an allegorical identification of Alceste and Queen Anne, and we are free from the difficulties involved in such an identification, although at the same time we hold to the notion of a compliment paid to the queen through the medium of Alceste. That there are grave difficulties in such an allegorical identification is undeniable. Among those to which Professor Kittredge called attention in the article cited above, the lines:

And whan this book is maad, yive hit the quene
On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene,

are in themselves almost conclusive against taking Alceste as the symbol of Queen Anne. We cannot possibly explain the words 'on my behalfe' ('with my compliments') on any theory of an identification. But if Alceste was selected by Chaucer as the Queen of the Court of Love because her virtues were those of Queen Anne, it was eminently fitting that she should bid Chaucer present his work, with the compliments of the Queen of the Court of Love, to the Queen of England. In other words, if we take Alceste as herself and nothing more, as a character in history or fiction, and not as a symbol, but recognise that Chaucer's choice of her as the Queen of the Court of Love was due to the fact that she was a model of the wifely virtues exemplified by Anne, we retain the sound notion that the Prologue was written by Chaucer as a compliment to the queen, and that he made Alceste the vehicle of his compliment, but avoid the difficulties involved in the theory of an allegorical identification.

The fact that Chaucer wrote the *Legend* with the expectation that Queen Anne² and (we may assume) King Richard would read it, gives

¹ B 484, 485.

² Evidence of the Queen's ability to read English is contained in the following passage printed by John Strype from 'an ancient ms. fragment, writ near three hundred years ago, formerly belonging to the church of Worcester':

Also the Bushop of Caunterbury, Thomas of Arundel, that now is, sey a sermon at Westminster, thereas was many an hundred of people, at the buryeng of Quene Anne, (of whose sowle God have mercy.) And in his commendation of her he seyde, That it was more joy of her, than of any woman, that ever he knew. For notwithstanding that she

a peculiar interest to the passage in the Prologue in which Alceste discourses upon the duties of kings. The interest of this passage does not depend upon our taking the God of Love as a symbol for King Richard, as Bilderbeck would do, for there is no question here of allegory at all¹. It is simply that, intending that the king and queen should be readers of his poem, Chaucer knew that if Alceste's advice to the God of Love was capable of a personal application, his royal readers might with perfect justice assume that he had foreseen and intended such a personal application. They would credit Chaucer with knowing what he was about, and with being able to see in advance how his (or Alceste's) *Regimen of Princes* would be regarded from the princely point of view. Let us see, therefore, how this passage would look to Richard.

The first part of it, B 342—372, A 318—352, and the last part, B 403—441, A 389—431, deal specifically with the situation between Chaucer and the God of Love. Alceste, in the first part, urges the God to give Chaucer a chance to reply to the accusations made against him; a god should be stable and ready to show mercy; the poet may have been falsely accused by a court tale-bearer; or, if he really did what he is accused of having done, there may be some excuse for his conduct. In the last part of her defence she urges the God, if Chaucer asks mercy, to be appeased; Chaucer has done good work for Love after all; Alceste therefore asks the God of Love not to hurt him, and promises that Chaucer shall offend no more, but make reparation for his offence. In both these parts of her plea she confines herself strictly to the specific case in hand.

Between these two parts, however, is a passage of somewhat different nature, not specific definition of what conduct the God of Love ought to exhibit in this case, but consideration of how kings and lords in general ought to behave on occasions like this one. She says:

This shulde a rightwys lord han in his thought,
And nat be lyk tiraunts of Lumbardye,
That usen wilfulhed and tirannye,
For he that king or lord is naturel,
Him oghte nat be tiraunt ne cruel,
As is a fermour, to doon the harm he can.

was alien born, [being the daughter of the Emperor Charles IV.] she had on English al the iiij Gospels, with the Doctors upon hem. And he seyde, that she sent them unto him. And he seyde, that they were good and true, and commended her, in that she was so great a lady, and also an alyan, and wolde study so holy, so vertuouse bokes.

(Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, Oxford, 1812, I, p. iii.)

The first edition of this work was published in 1694. For reference to the passage I am indebted to F. A. Gasquet's *Old English Bible*.

¹ Bilderbeck, *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women*, pp. 84—104, 109. For Lowes's refutation of this position see *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, xix, 674, 675; xx, 773—779. See also Tatlock, p. 120.

He moste thinke hit is his lige man,
 *And that him oweth, of verray duetee,
 *Shewen his peple pleyn beniguitee,
 *And wel to here hir excusaciouns,
 *And hir compleyntes and peticiouns,
 *In duewe tyme, whan they shal hit profre.
 This is the sentence of the philosophre:
 A king to kepe his liges in lustyce;
 With-uten doute, that is his offyce.
 *And thereto is a king ful depe y-sworn,
 *Ful many an hundred winter heer-biforn;
 And for to kepe his lordes hir degree,
 As hit is right and skilful that they be
 Enhaunced and honoured, and most dere—
 For they ben half-goddes in this world here—
 This shal he doon, bothe to pore [and] riche,
 Al be that here stat be nat a-liche,
 And han of pore folk compassioun.
 For lo, the gentil kind of the lioun!
 For whan a flye offendeth him or byteth,
 He with his tayl away the flye smyteth
 Al esily; for, of his genterye,
 Him deyneth nat to wreke him on a flye,
 As doth a curre or elles another beste.
 In noble corage oghte been areste,
 And weyen every thing by equitee,
 And ever han reward to his owen degree.
 For, sir, hit is no maystrie for a lord
 To damne a man with-oute answeere or word;
 And, for a lord, that is ful foul to use¹.

Now this is excellent advice for the God of Love², but it is as good or better advice for Richard, and if he had followed it the whole course of English history in the succeeding century might have been different. And the language of the passage is so general³ that it applies to all kings, not merely the God of Love. If Richard failed to see its applicability to himself he must have been singularly deficient in self-knowledge; and if Chaucer failed to foresee its applicability to his sovereign he was considerably more naive than we have hitherto supposed him to have been.

SAMUEL MOORE.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

¹ A 353—388. The lines marked with an asterisk are not in B.

² See Lowes, *l.c.*, xx, 774 ff., showing that what Alceste says on the duties of kings is not 'dragged in,' as Bilderbeck asserted, but perfectly apposite. We ought to recognise, however, that the matter is certainly over-emphasised, if Chaucer was concerned exclusively with the God of Love and not at all with King Richard. Alceste's speech is nearly one-fifth of the B prologue, and more than a fifth of A. The passage I have quoted is almost a third of the whole speech and (except for rime) could be omitted without causing a perceptible lacuna. Cf. Tatlock, p. 121.

³ The 'half-goddes' of A 373, indeed, is an indication that Chaucer at this point was thinking more of the general applicability of Alceste's discourse than of its particular reference to the God of Love. For a strict attention to the allegory would have required him to liken the attendant divinities of the God of Love to feudal lords, rather than to liken feudal lords to them.

RICHARDSON'S CHARACTER OF LOVELACE.

AMONG the most interesting problems in connection with Richardson is that of the origin of the character of Lovelace in the novel of *Clarissa*¹. It has often been suggested that Lothario in Rowe's tragedy of *The Fair Penitent*² is the original of Lovelace. The resemblance however between the two characters has not yet been worked out in detail.

The similarity between the characters of Lothario and Lovelace was first pointed out by Johnson in his life of Rowe³.

The character of Lothario seems to have been expanded by Richardson into Lovelace; but he has excelled his original in the moral effect of the fiction. Lothario, with gaiety⁴ which cannot be hated, and bravery⁴ which cannot be despised, retains too much of the spectator's kindness. It was in the power of Richardson alone to teach us at once esteem and detestation, to make virtuous resentment overpower all the benevolence which wit, elegance, and courage, naturally excite; and to lose at last the hero in the villain.

Austin Dobson is of the same opinion and considers Rowe's Lothario to be a 'much more likely model for Lovelace' than Philip, Duke of Wharton⁵.

It is worthy of remark that neither Johnson nor Dobson has quoted a significant passage in Richardson's *Clarissa* in this connection. In this novel Richardson himself has pointed out the resemblance between the characters of Lothario and Lovelace and the lack of resemblance between Calista, the heroine in *The Fair Penitent*, and Clarissa.

Belford wrote to his friend Lovelace on this subject as follows (*Clarissa*, VIII, 24, 25):

The whole story of the other is a pack of damned stuff. Lothario, 'tis true, seems another wicked ungenerous varlet as thou knowest who: the author knew

¹ *The Novels of Samuel Richardson*, 20 volumes, London, 1902.

² *The Fair Penitent* by Nicholas Rowe, edited by S. C. Hart, Boston, 1907.

³ *Lives of the Most Eminent Poets* (Chandos Edition), London, n.d., p. 216.

⁴ Cp. *The Fair Penitent*, v, i, 37:

'Is this that haughty, gallant, gay Lothario?'

⁵ *Samuel Richardson* by Austin Dobson, London, 1902, p. 13.

how to draw a rake ; but not to paint a penitent. Calista is a desiring luscious wench, and her penitence is nothing but rage, insolence and scorn¹.

Richardson was well acquainted with Rowe's plays which he frequently quoted in his novels, especially in *Clarissa*². In one passage in this novel Richardson refers to the outward resemblance but essential difference between the characters of Calista and Clarissa. This passage is a proof that Richardson had continually Rowe's play in his mind when writing *Clarissa*. Belford wrote to his friend Lovelace on the subject of *Clarissa* as follows (*Clarissa*, VIII, 24):

I have frequently thought on my attendance on this lady that, if Belton's admired author, Nic. Rowe, had such a character before him, he would have drawn another sort of penitent than he has done, or given his play which he calls *The Fair Penitent* another title³. Miss Harlowe a penitent indeed ! I think if I am not guilty of a contradiction in terms, a penitent without a fault, her parents' conduct from the first considered.

A detailed comparison will show that Richardson's statements as to the similarity between Lothario and Lovelace and as to the lack of resemblance between Calista and Clarissa are to be accepted. It may indeed be said that Richardson's Lovelace stands in the same relation to Rowe's Lothario as the latter to its original, young Novall in Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry*, the source of *The Fair Penitent*. Lovelace is considered by Johnson to be an improvement on Lothario⁴, Lothario surpasses Novall in interest⁵. Here is the place to consider the similarity between Lothario and Lovelace. In their conduct towards Calista and Clarissa Lothario and Lovelace are actuated by revenge. Lothario before the play begins had asked Sciolto, Calista's father, for her hand, but had been refused. Sciolto gave his daughter to Altamont whom he had assisted in much the same way as Charalois in the *Fatal Dowry* was helped by Rochfort. Sciolto's refusal to give him his daughter was the origin of Lothario's desire of revenge.

¹ Johnson was of the same opinion : 'It has been observed, that the title of the play does not sufficiently correspond with the behaviour of Calista, who at last shows no evident signs of repentance, but may reasonably be suspected of feeling pain from detection rather than from guilt, and expresses more shame than sorrow, and more rage than shame,' *Lives of the Poets*, p. 216.

² The list in Poetzsche's *Samuel Richardsons Belesenheit* (Kiel, 1908) is not complete. In *Clarissa*, VII, 258 *The Fair Penitent*, v, i, 80—84 is quoted. In *Clarissa*, v, 161, the story of Rowe's being advised by a peer to learn Spanish is told, cp. Johnson, *ib.* p. 218.

³ Cp. *The Fair Penitent*, London, n.d., Remarks, p. 4.

⁴ 'The Fair Penitent has justly been pronounced a misnomer. It should have been the Fair Wanton—for there is not a shadow of repentance in any part of Calista's character.'

⁵ *Ib.* p. 216.

⁶ Cp. Cumberland, *Observer*, No. 78 (London, 1803): 'Rowe has no doubt greatly outstepped his original in the striking character of Lothario, who leaves Novall as far behind him as Charalois does Altamont.'

Lothario told his friend Rossano of his wish to 'gaul' Sciolto and Altamont (*The Fair Penitent*, I, i, 131—135):

I lik'd her, wou'd have marry'd her,
But that it pleas'd her father to refuse me,
To make this honourable fool her husband.
For which, if I forget him, may the shame
I mean to brand his name with; stick on mine.

Even at the moment of his death at the hands of Calista's husband Lothario cannot help rejoicing at the success of his plans of revenge (*The Fair Penitent*, IV, i, 115—16):

That sweet revenge comes smiling to my thoughts,
Adorns my fall, and cheers my heart in dying.

For the same reasons Lovelace wished to revenge himself for his treatment by Clarissa's father and brother. 'Then my revenge on the Harlowes' (*Clarissa*, VII, 333). There is a similar passage in *Clarissa*, III, 112.

A desire to revenge himself on the sex was also a motive in Lovelace's conduct to Clarissa (*Clarissa*, I, 206):

I have boasted I was once in love before. It was in my early manhood—with that quality jilt, whose infidelity I have vowed to revenge upon as many of the sex as shall come into my power.

Lothario and Lovelace lose their lives in their plans of revenge. Lothario is killed in a duel by Calista's husband, Altamont; Lovelace perishes miserably in the same way at the hands of Clarissa's cousin, Colonel Morden.

Lothario and Lovelace had little inclination to marry. Lothario expressed his views on this subject to Rossano (*The Fair Penitent*, I, 187—195):

Again she told the same dull nauseous tale.
Unmov'd I beg'd her spare th' ungrateful subject,
Since I resolv'd, that love and peace of mind
Might flourish long inviolate between us,
Never to load it with the marriage chain;
That I would still retain her in my heart,
My ever gentle mistress and my friend;
But those other names of wife and husband,
They only meant ill-nature, cares and quarrels.

On this subject Lovelace wrote to his friend Jack Belford (*Clarissa*, VII, 129):

'Tis ungentlemanly, Jack, man to man, to lie. But matrimony I do not heartily love—although with a Clarissa—yet I am in earnest to marry her.

Lothario and Lovelace are brave even to rashness and are in no

wise ashamed of their actions. On this point Lothario expressed his views to Altamont's friend Horatio (*The Fair Penitent*, II, ii, 38—41):

There's not a purpose
Which my soul ever fram'd, or my hand acted,
But I could well have bid the world look on,
And what I once durst do, have dar'd to justifye.

Lovelace was so little ashamed of his actions that he made light of the effect of the reading of Clarissa's letters by his relations although they contained evidence of his behaviour towards her (*Clarissa*, VII, 301):

What we have been told of the agitations and workings, and sighings and sobbings, of the French prophets formerly, was nothing at all to the scene exhibited by these maudlin souls, at the reading of these letters.

Lothario and Lovelace are both very proud of the importance of their respective families. Lothario in his first conversation with Horatio referred to the greatness of his family in Genoa in no very modest terms (*The Fair Penitent*, II, ii, 28—32):

Ha! dost thou know me? that I am Lothario?
As great a name as this proud city boasts of.
Who is this mighty man then, this Horatio,
That I should basely hide me from his anger,
Lest he should chide me for his friend's displeasure?

Lovelace speaks often of the splendour of his family in comparison with Clarissa's.

Then, what a triumph it would be for the Harlowe pride, were I to marry this lady! a family beneath my own (*Clarissa*, III, 112)¹.

But was ever hero in Romance (fighting with giants and dragons excepted) called upon to harder trials? Fortune and family, and reversionary grandeur on my side! Such a wretched fellow my competitor (i.e. Roger Solmes)! (*Clarissa*, I, 112.)

The characters of Calista and Clarissa are quite different from one another. Lothario had no great difficulty in gaining the love of Calista. The words exchanged by Lothario and Rossano on this point illustrate Calista's character (*The Fair Penitent*, I, i, 136—139):

Rossano. She, gentle soul, was kinder than her father.
Lothario. She was, and oft in private gave me hearing,
"Till by long list'ning to the soothing tale
At length her easie heart was wholly mine.

Lovelace had in this respect no success. Clarissa had only 'a conditional liking' for him. Richardson, unlike Rowe, had a great objection to the expression of any passionate feelings. In the words

¹ Cf. *Clarissa*, III, 333.

of Johnson placed by him at the head of Richardson's article in the *Rambler* (No. 97), Richardson 'taught the passions to move at the command of virtue.'

Calista complied with the wishes of her father Sciolto and married Altamont. Her point of view she explained to her father when he reproached her with her coldness towards her newly-married husband (*The Fair Penitent*, III, i, 12—15):

Has not your daughter giv'n herself to Altamont,
Yielded the native freedom of her will,
To an imperious husband's lordly rule,
To gratifie a father's stern command?

Clarissa in spite of threats refused to marry Solmes to please her father, although she was not at all in love with Lovelace. For this reason she was treated badly by her relations who firmly believed she preferred the great enemy of the family, Lovelace. It was not till Clarissa's death that the Harlowe family saw their injustice and mistakes.

It is possible that such men as Philip, Duke of Wharton, or Cibber¹ may have afforded hints for the character of Lovelace. Leigh Hunt thought the name of the hero of *Clarissa* was suggested by the Cavalier poet, Richard Lovelace². Miss Thomson, following Le Breton, *Le Roman au dix-septième Siècle*, suggests the Comte de Grammont as a likely source of Lovelace³. The resemblance however between Lothario and Lovelace, pointed out by Richardson and confirmed by comparison, makes it certain that Rowe's character is the chief constituent in the character of the betrayer of Clarissa.

H. G. WARD.

AACHEN.

¹ Cf. Leigh Hunt, *The Town* (London, 1859), pp. 91—2.

³ *Samuel Richardson*, by C. L. Thomson, London, 1900, p. 141.

² *Ib.* p. 87.

ON SOME ETYMOLOGIES OF ENGLISH WORDS.

(Continued from p. 325.)

MARTINGALE. This word is not a native Provençal word, as S.D.¹ explains, accepting with Littré and Scheler the explanation of Ménage. The genealogy of *martingale* (for holding down a horse's head) is as follows: Fr. *martingale* < Prov. *martingalo*, *martegalo* < Span. *almartaga* (with the Arab. *al* def. art.) a rein to hold a horse (Stevens), from an Arab. root *rata'a*, cp. Arab. *rata'* 'un pieu auquel on attache une bête,' in common use in Algeria. See Dozy, *Glossaire* (s.v. *Almartaga*). For the termination *-ale* (*-alo*) < Lat. *-alis*, compare the *-al* in Fr. *amiral* (E. *admiral*), as explained by Dozy (s.v. *Almirante*), and the *-ale* in *galingale*.

PILLORY. S.D. says, 'Of unknown origin.' One may find in Ducange many examples of the French form *pillorie* under the word 'Pilorium,' dating from the first quarter of the thirteenth century. The word was introduced from the South of France, as may be inferred from the fuller forms of the word found in Provençal, namely *espilori*, *espitlori*. This latter spelling is crucial, pointing the way to a satisfactory etymology. A Latin type *spectac(u)lorium* 'a place for a spectacle' would be represented in Provençal quite regularly by *espitlori*. By haplology *spectac'lorium* would become *spect'lorium*, the second syllable ending in *c* being lost before the stressed syllable (cp. the words *idolatry*, *matins*, *rotund*, *retable*).

RASCAL. S.D. says, 'Of unknown origin.' It is useful to note that this word was originally used in a collective sense. The old form of the word in English and French was *rascaille*, with the collective French suffix *-aille* (< Lat. neuter pl. *-alia*), appearing in *canaille*, *valetaille*, *prétraille*, etc. In Old French the word *rascaille* had the meaning of scum, dregs, offal, rubbish, which appears to be the original

¹ Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, ed. 4, 1910.

meaning; whence was derived the figurative sense, a rabble or mob, especially the rabble of an army, camp-followers and the like. Both these uses of the word *rascaille* are found in English. The word in slightly differing forms appears with both meanings in the Promptorium: '*Rascaly* or refuse qwere so hit be—*caducum*'; and '*Rascayle* or simple people—*infimas*' (Winch. MS. p. 366). Cotgrave gives the primary, as well as the secondary, meaning: '*Racaille* (1) the scum, dregs, and (2) the rascality or base and rascall sort,...the outcasts of any company.' What is the etymology of O.F. *rascaille* dregs? I think that it is connected with the Provençal *raca* 'marc de raisin' (Lévy); cp. mod. Prov. *raco* 'marc de vendange' (see Glossary to Mistral's *Mirèio*). This word has lost an initial dental, as we may infer from the mod. Prov. forms *draco*, *dracho*, *traco*, *treco*. The mod. Prov. *draco* answers to O.F. *drache* husks of grapes, *dracque* in Palsgrave, and Anglo-Norm. *draque* (Moisy). This French form *draque* has left a trace in the dialect of Devon in the word *drakes* a slop, a mess (E.D.D.). The loss of the initial *d* in the Provençal forms is paralleled in the O.F. forms *rancle*, *raöncle* for older *drancle*, *draöncle*; see S.D. (s.v. *Rankle*). It is probable that O.F. *drache* (with the cognate forms) is of Teutonic origin, as is suggested by Oskar Henniecke in his Glossary to Mistral's *Mirèio*. An older form of the O.F. *drache* is found in *drasche* 'cosse de légume' which can be referred to a Teutonic type *drastjōn*, whence O.E. *dærstan*, dregs, lees, and *drestés* (in Palsgrave), see N.E.D. (s.v. *Drast*). See Mackel, *Germ. Elemente* (1887), 158, and S.D. (s.v. *Rack* 4).

SCOTCH, to cut with narrow incisions. S.D. says, 'It seems to be an extension from *scoren*, to score, affected by the verb *scorch*, to flay.' This can hardly be deemed a satisfactory explanation. The earliest quotation given by N.E.D. is from Hoccleve (c. 1412), in which a face is said to be '*scocched*' with knives. N.E.D. does not venture on an etymology.

The word *scotch* to make an incision, to gash is doubtless identical with Ang.-Nor. *escocher* 'entamer la peau' (Moisy). This word is a derivative of Fr. *coche* 'a nock, notch, the nut-hole of a cross-bow' (Cotgrave). Compare Ital. *cocca* 'the nut of a cross-bow, the nock of an arrow, also, a dent of anything' (Florio); hence, *coccare* 'far entrar la corda dell' arco, nella cocca; *Accoccare*' (Fanfani).

TIKE. It is generally agreed that the word 'tike,' a term in frequent use in the north country for a dog or cur, is identical with the Scandinavian *tik* a bitch. E.D.D. shows that 'tike' is widely used

in the north metaphorically for a rough, ill-mannered, churlish fellow. E.D.D. and S.D. tell us that this use of the word is found in *Piers Plowman* (B. xix, 37), a text written in the west midland dialect:

As wyde as the worlde is wonyth there none
But under tribut and taillage as *tykes* and cherles.

It would appear from the context that the word 'tykes' in this passage is not used in a metaphorical or contemptuous sense. The description 'tykes and cherles' has a political value, denoting a definite social class subject to 'tribut and taillage.' The west midland political class-name must be kept quite distinct from the northern synonym for a cur. I would suggest that it may be identical with a word of frequent occurrence in the Ancient Laws of Wales in the sense of a villein or churl, namely *taiawc* (mod. Welsh *taiog*). See Glossary and Index to *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales*. The word literally means a householder; Old Celtic *tegácos* householder, deriv. of *tegos* (Welsh *ty*) house. Compare Cornish *tīak* (*tīoc*) a farmer, Williams' Dict. (1865). 'Tyacke' is not an uncommon Cornish surname.

TOPAZ. S.D. suggests connexion with Skr. *tapas* fire, but does not support the conjecture with any argument. The Gr. *τόπαζος* (also *τόπαζον*, *τοπάζιον*) the yellow topaz is probably of Semitic origin. It probably came into the Greek language through the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the Septuagint (Ps. cxviii, 127) *τοπάζιον* occurs as a rendering of the Hebrew word *páz* ('fine gold,' A.V.). Schleusner suggests that the reading should be *τὸ πάζιον*. In Ps. xviii, 11 the Hebrew *páz* is rendered *λίθος τίμιος* (a precious stone). This seems to corroborate the derivation of 'topaz' the name of the yellow precious stone from *páz* the Hebrew word for fine gold—the Greek definite article having become a part of the word.

II. *Objections to Etymologies in S.D., mainly on phonetic grounds, without the suggestion of alternative derivations.*

HACKNEY. S.D. identifies this name for a horse with *Hackney* the name of the village north of London. This explanation leaves out of consideration the fact that the word in numberless forms is in common use all over West Europe, and is widely spread along the shores of the Mediterranean. A comparison of these forms will, I think, show conclusively that the word does not owe its origin to the name of an English village. There is not the slightest historical evidence

that the term was originally applied specially to English horses. Here are some of the continental forms of the word: O.F. *haquenée* 'an ambling horse or mare, especially for ladies to ride on'; Sp. *hacanea*; Ital. *acchinéu*, also *chinea* (Florio); O. Prov. *haqueneia*, *acanea*, *facanea*; O. Sp. and Port. *fucanea*. From the French word was adopted at an early period Dutch *hackeneie*. With these Romanic words we may associate the shortened forms O.F. *haque*, O. Prov. *haca*, *faca*, O. Sp. *faca*—all used in the sense of 'nag, gelding.' It is to be noted that the oldest forms of the word in the Mediterranean countries have *f*-initial not *h*-; this seems to point to a foreign, probably to an Arabic origin. In Ducange I find '*Haque, Equus Haque* "Semiexsectus, à moitié coupé," ann. 1457.' The most common meaning of the word seems to have been 'a gelding.'

JURY-MAST. S.D. says '*jury* perhaps short for **ajúry* < O.F. *ajuirie* aid (Godefroy).' Alas! this is a conjecture unsupported by any historical evidence. S.D. adds, 'Cf. *iuwere* "remedium" Prompt. Parv.' This does not help much, as '*iuwere*' = med. Lat. *iuveria* (the office of judge); see Ducange (s.v. *juveria*), and '*remedium*' means 'Remedium legis, Appellatio a sententia judicis inferioris ad superiorem' (Duc.). See Promptorium (Winch. MS. E.E.T.S., 1908, note no. 1132).

MOUND. The oldest meaning of this word according to the evidence in N.E.D. was 'a hedge or other fence bounding a field or garden.' This meaning is now current only in Oxfordshire and the counties near its border (see E.D.D.). This makes rather doubtful the equation of *mound* with Anglo-Fr. *mund* (*munt*) a hill. Any 'confusion' of *mound* with O.E. *mund* is not to be thought of. The ordinary use of O.E. *mund* was as a technical legal term in the sense of protection, guardianship extended by the king to the subject, by the head of a family to its members. This word seems to have become obsolete early in the thirteenth century; the last quotation for it given in N.E.D. is from Layamon (ann. 1205). But the earliest quotation in N.E.D. for *mound* (a hedge) is from Crowley (ann. 1551).

PAWN, a pledge. S.D. says '*pawn* < Fr. *pan* a pane; a pawn or gage.' The regular phonetic equivalent of Fr. *pan* 'a pane, skirt' in English is *pane*. The pronunciation *pawn* points to an O.F. *an* + dental, and so to the O.F. *pand*, *pant* (*pan* in Cotgrave) pledge, security, surety, also booty. For the phonology compare E. *spawn* vb. < O.F. *espandre* to shed, scatter. S.D. wavers between two contradictory opinions about the etymology of the French word *pan* (*pand*, *pant*) a pledge. At first,

it is said to be of Teutonic origin, and in the last paragraph 'all the forms [Teutonic and Romanic] may be ultimately referred to L. *pamius*.' I believe that O.F. *pand* is neither of Teutonic origin, nor derived from *pamius*. The E. pronunciation is against the latter hypothesis, as also the final dental of the O.F. *pand*. The initial *p* (*ph*, *pf*) in the Teutonic forms points to a non-Germanic origin. We cannot get beyond the med. Lat. form *pandum* in Ducange.

POUR, to emit in a stream. S.D. identifies this word with O.F. *purer*. But there are difficulties in this equation, difficulties semantic and phonetic. The verb 'pour' from its earliest appearance in English literature in the fourteenth century to the present day has always had the same meaning 'to cause or allow a liquid or granular substance to flow out of a vessel or receptacle' (N.E.D.). The essential and radical meaning of the French verb *purer* is very different. 'O.F. *purer* "presser des légumes pour en faire sortir le jus ou la pulpe,"—this is the definition given in Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, and this is the meaning that the verb has in the Norman dialects, as may be seen from the quotations in S.D. O.F. *purer* appears to be the same word as the Lat. *pūrāre* found in *sup-pūrāre* to suppurate, a derivative of *pūs*, and cognate of *pūrlentus*, cp. Gr. *πύω* and *πύον*.

Discussing the etymology E. *pour* < Fr. *purer* N.E.D. says, 'The phonology presents difficulty. It is doubtful whether English has any certain instance of *ou* from Fr. *u* < Lat. *ū*.' The case of E. *scour* (to cleanse by rubbing) < Latin type *excūrāre* (O.F. *escurer*) is not analogous. Probably 'scour' was adopted by us as a technical term introduced by Flemish workmen, cp. Dutch *schuren* (see N.E.D.), and so came to us through a Germanic medium.

RUMMAGE. This word meant primarily the arranging of casks, etc., in the hold of a vessel. It is comparatively a modern word in English. N.E.D. has no quotations earlier than the sixteenth century. It originated in the wine trade carried on in Spain, Portugal and the South of France. S.D. appears to hold that the word was manufactured in England, and simply stands for 'roomage.' N.E.D. gives the right explanation. *Rummage* is an aphetic adoption of older Fr. *arrumage* (also Sp.) from *arrumer* (mod. *arrimer*), = Sp. and Port. *arrumar*, Prov. *arumar*. The etymology of this Mediterranean trade word is doubtful. Prof. Weekley has given a full discussion of the various theories in his paper on *Anglo-French Etymologies* (1909), p. 27. The primary meaning of the verb seems to have been 'to arrange.'

SARACEN. S.D. still explains 'Saracen' as meaning literally 'one of the *eastern* people,' deriving the word from the Arab. *sharq* east, the quarter of the rising sun. But S.D. refers us to the well-known note in Gibbon, ch. 50, so that this etymology is not looked upon as quite certain. Surely the last and most popular of the etymologies of 'Saracen' should be rejected as impossible. As Gibbon observes, 'it is refuted by Ptolemy who expressly remarks the *western* position of the Saracens, then an obscure tribe on the borders of Egypt.' From this 'obscure tribe' was derived the general appellation of Saracens for the Arabian tribes extending from Mecca to the Euphrates. The original meaning of the name of this 'obscure tribe' must remain obscure. Probably it is not of Arabic origin. At any rate the geographical position of the tribe with regard to the other Arabs is against the hypothesis of a derivation from an Arabic word meaning 'Oriental.'

III. Criticisms on phonetic details in S.D.

BUREAU. O.F. *buire* does not represent Lat. *būrrus*, as S.D. says, but a Late Lat. type *būrius*, which is also seen in Ital. *buio*, see Diez, p. 74. The cognates in the various Romanic languages have *u* constant in the radical syllable, which points to a Lat. *ū* (see N.E.D. s.v. *Bureau*). Consequently, the Chaucer word *borel* (*burel*) in 'borel men' (C.T. B. 3145) and 'burel folk' (C.T. D. 1872) must be kept apart from *bureau*.

DESPATCH, to send off with expedition, Span. *despachar*. Compare Prov. *despachar* 'finir son affaire' (Lévy). The Latin type would be **dispactare*, from the Lat. pp. *pactus* 'fixed, fastened,' so that **dispactare* would mean to *unfix*, to set free. The synonymous Ital. *dispacciare* (*spacciare*) is from a Latin type **dispactiare*. Compare the southern forms given under 'Impeach' (see below).

IMPEACH. Under this word S.D. places together various words and forms in the Romanic languages which have the meaning of impeding, hindering. This notion is expressed in the northern and southern languages by similar words of two radically distinct origins. E. *impeach* < O.F. *empescher* represents Lat. *impedicare* to hinder, from *pedica* a fetter. Prov. and Span. *empachar* represent a Latin type *impactare* to hold fast, to hinder, from Lat. pp. *pactus* fixed, fastened. Ital. *impacciare* to hinder, represents a Latin type *impactiare* (not *impacticare*, as stated in S.D.).

It may be noted that the southern form Prov. *empedegar* is a learned form of Lat. *impedicare*, as may be seen from the retention of the pretonic vowel.

JADE, a kind of green stone. This word means lit. 'the colic (stone),' being ultimately derived from a Lat. type *iliata*, deriv. of Lat. *ilia* the flanks. The steps between the form *jade* and *iliata* are: Fr. *jade*, *le jade* < *l'éjade* (ann. 1633) < Span. *ijada*, in *piedra de ijada* (ann. 1569), < Lat. *iliata*. Cp. Span. *mal de Ijada* 'the Chollick, a Pain in the Flank' (Stevens). For the disappearance of Lat. *l* before *i*, cp. Lat. *filium*, *folia* > Sp. *hijo*, *hoja*.

JADE, a contemptuous name for a horse. There is no doubt that *jade* is the same word as the Scottish *yaud* with the same meaning. They can both be derived from the same Old Norse word, the Icel. *yalda* a mare. *Yalda* would give **jaude* in Norm.-French, whence E. *jade* quite regularly; cp. *safe* < Fr. *sauf* < Lat. *salvum* and *sage* < O.F. *sauge* < Lat. *salvia*. The Sc. *yaud* is derived directly from the Norse, while E. *jade* comes to us through a French dialect.

ORANGE. S.D. derives the O.F. *orenge* immediately from the Ital. *arancia* (Florio). The fruit and its name came into northern France immediately from the south—from Provence and Languedoc. O.F. *orenge* is derived directly from Prov. *auranja* with the usual change *au* > *o*. The *aur-* in Prov. *auranja* is due to *aur* gold, from the golden colour of the fruit, and takes the place of an earlier *n*)*aranja*, cp. Span. *naranja* < Arab. *nāranj* < Pers. *nārang*. From a distinct Latin type **n*)*arantia* we get the Ital. forms *narancia* (*arancia*) in Florio, and *rancia* (Dante, *Purg.* II, 9); cp. Med. Lat. *pomerancia* [*pomum* + *arantia*], whence Ger. *Pomeranze* orange, and Mod. Gr. *νεράντζι* (see Triandaphyllidis *Lehnwörter*, 1909, p. 132).

PAPER. Fr. *papier* is not the phonetic equivalent of Lat. *pap̄rum* (*pap̄rum*); the *-ier* shows change of suffix (*-ĕrum*). There is also a Romanic type *paperum* which is vouched for by Welsh and Italian forms. Rom. **pap̄rum* will account for Welsh *pabwyr* the wick of a lamp or candle, for which a reed was formerly used; and for Ital. *papéro* a gunner's match (Florio), also *papejo* the wick of a candle (Fanfani).

PARTISAN, one who takes part. Fr. *partisan* is not derived directly from the Tuscan form *partigiano*, but from one of the Italian dialect forms which retain the original *s*, cp. Roman and Neapol. *partisano*,

Upper Italian *partezan* (see N.E.D.). The sound *gi* is a Tuscan development of the Latin *si*, cp. the place-names *Perugia* < *Perusia*, *Parigi* < *Parisii*.

PLEACH—PLASH. S.D. does not explain how these two forms are connected with one another, and how they can both be derived from one Latin type **plectiare*. The difference in form is due to the fact that *pleach* and *plash* came to us from different French dialects—*plash* from Central French, and *pleach* from the Picard dialect: (1) E. *plash* (dial. *plash*) < O.F. *plaisier*, *plissier* (to plait, interweave, twine) represents a Latin type **plectiare*, deriv. of Lat. *plectere*, cp. O.F. *plaisse*, *plesse* a hedge, whence med. Lat. *plessa* 'virgulta implexa' (Duc.). (2) E. *pleach* represents O.F. (northern) *plechier* (mod. F. *plécher*). 'Plash' is much the older form in English. The Centr. Fr. form *plaisier* occurs in Anglo-Norman in Wace's poems—*Rom. de Brut* and *Rom. de Rou*. See Moisy (s.v. *Plessier*).

RAISIN. S.D. explains 'Fr. *raisin* < Folk Latin *racimum*.' Surely the Romanic (or Folk Latin) form was *racemum* < Lat. *racēnum*. Compare *plaisir* < Rom. *placere*; *loisir* < *licere*; *cire* < *cera*.

SEWER, one who sets dishes on the table. This is an aphetic form of *assewer* with the same meaning (see N.E.D.) < Anglo-Fr. *assëour* (Godefroy) < Late Lat. *assedatorem* 'qui fait asseoir,' a derivative of Lat. *sedare* to cause to sit.

SHERRY. S.D. says '(Span.-L.)' It should be '(Span.-Arab.-L.)' The old form *sherris* is due to *Xeres* the Spanish name of the famous town near Cadiz, of which the Arabic form was *sheréysh*. See Dozy, *Glossaire*, p. 18. The Roman name for this Xeres was *Caesaris Asidona*. By the loss of the first syllable *Caesaris* became on the lips of the Moors *sheréysh*¹. Lat. *s* is regularly represented by Arab. *sh* (whence the Span. *x*), compare Arab. *shatriya*, Span. *axedrea*, both derived from Lat. *satureia* (Dozy, p. 219). It should be noted that the Roman names *Caesar*, *Cesarea* are transliterated in Arabic with initial *q* (not *sh*), e.g. *qaiṣar*, *qaiṣāriyya*. Compare Lat. *castra* whence Arab. *qaṣr* 'castle,' and Span. *alcazar* 'citadel' (Dozy, p. 90).

SKATES. S.D. does not give a very clear account of the phonetic relations between this word and its continental cognates. The English

¹ For a similar decapitation of the word *Caesar*, compare the name of the Spanish city *Zaragoza* < *Caesar Augusta*.

form *skates*, although understood by us as a plural, is identical with Dutch *schaats* 'a skate,' the equivalent of O.F. (Picard) *escache* (in pl. *escaches* stilts). In Jersey and Guernsey *écaches* is the patois word for stilts. Derived directly from the Picard form *escache* is the E. *scatch* 'a stilt,' occurring in Levin's *Manipulus* (N.E.D.), now obsolete, except in dialects (see E.D.D. s.v. *Sketch*). The mod. Fr. *échasse* 'stilt' is due to O.F. *eschace*, *escace*, the central French pronunciation of the Picard *escache*. For the phonology we may compare Du. *schaats* < Pic. *escache* (E. *scatch*) = Cent. Fr. *escace* (mod. Fr. *échasse*) with Du. *Kaats* ('chase') < Pic. *cachier* (E. *catch*) = Cent. Fr. *chacier* (mod. Fr. *chasser*, E. *chase*). To sum up, *skates* = Dutch *schaats* 'a skate' < Pic. *escache*, and *scatch* (*sketch*) = Pic. *escache*. The French word is, as S.D. shows, of Germanic origin.

STUBBLE. S.D. says that 'Late Lat. *stupula* is a variant of Lat. *stipula* due to the influence of Low G. *stoppel* stubble (Lübben).' This is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance. O.H.G. *stupfla*, M.H.G. *stupfel* (stubble) are due to Lat. *stupula* (*stupla*), and Lübben's word *stoppel* is a comparatively late Low German form of the same Latin word. The change *u* < *i* in late Latin is noted in Rönisch, *Itala* (1875), p. 465, and did not require any Teutonic influence; it is met with in Petronius. It may be noted that there are equivalents of Lat. *stup(u)la* both in the north and south of France—cp. Norman-Fr. *estoble*, *estuble* (Moisy), and Prov. *estobla* (Lévy).

TALLY. S.D. explains the *-y* as due to the French pp. suffix *-é* (< Lat. *-ata*). The Anglo-Fr. form is *taillie* (a tally), due to an Anglo-Lat. *talia* (*tallia*); cp. Lat. *talea* a stick cut with transverse notches. Hence Fr. *tailler* to cut, of which *taille* a notch is a verbal substantive.

A. L. MAYHEW.

OXFORD.

SHELLEY'S 'WITCH OF ATLAS.'

IN August of the year 1820 Shelley started from the Baths of St Julian under the Pisan hills for a short tour to the summit of Monte San Pellegrino. In a deep trance of inspiration following his return home he wrote the 670 lines of *The Witch of Atlas* in three days. The fable of the Witch may be divided into three parts or chapters. The first (I—XX) tells how a Nymph bore her to the Sun in a cave of Mount Atlas, and of the strange treasures of her dwelling, and how all the demons and creatures of earth were attracted to her, and how she tempered her beauty to mortal eyes by a veil of cloud and light. The second part (XXI—XLVI) tells how the Lady might not accept the companionship of the earthly creatures, and how she created a being to be her companion. At first she lived alone in her cave, sending out her thoughts through all the Universe; for when the beings of earth desired to live with her, she refused them, saying that there could be no equal love between mortal and immortal. When they had left her she wept in her solitude. Then she tempered fire and snow together in the medium of Love, and made from them a shape of great beauty, a Hermaphrodite with no defect of either sex and with all the grace of both. She loved to drift with the Hermaphrodite down mountain streams in a magic boat, the gift of Apollo her father, wherein the Hermaphrodite would lie dreaming the while; and if she wished to speed up stream, she waked him, and he would oar the boat with his pinions to the mountain springs. In the third part (XLVII—LXXVIII) we read of the many pranks of the Witch. She would fare to the Antarctic Ocean and live there in a misty tent, where her ministers would bring news of mankind, at which she would grow pale, or laugh, or cry. She sported in the clouds and winds, and there were halcyon days for men when she came near the earth. Or she would pass by night among the cities on the Nile to watch the slumberers, rejoicing in the sight of fair and happy life, and not dismayed by the sight of evil, for her spirit could plunge at any time to the deeps of calm beneath the welter of things. Seeing into men's hearts she would

cause the spirits of the good to mingle with her own, or give them panaceas, or turn their deaths into dreamy trances. In the slaves of Custom she would raise dreams that mocked the purposes of their lives, and bring together bashful lovers and estranged friends. Such were the tricks she played, and thereby she did not feel that longing for a reciprocal love by which in after days her soul is said to have been vexed (LXVIII).

Thrown off to all appearance as a toy of the fancy, or as it were for a marginal design to some greater work, the verses are all instinct with the attar of Shelley's poetry. Nowhere else does he more remind us of those primordial Spirits who shouted for joy at the wonders of Creation, and who would range, not the haunts of men, but the firmament, the storm-clouds and mists, the seas and mountain steeps. Nor does he play so long and so exquisitely in any other poem with his peculiar gift for the making of a myth or a fairy tale. Shelley always exercises this gift in a grave and tender mood, as in the *Prometheus*, for instance when he sends out the Spirit of the Earth to spy upon men, or in the story of Cythna in her sea-cave; but here the gravity and tenderness are shot through with that playful comedy which is the dominant colour of his work in these summer months of 1820, at its best in the *Letter to Maria Gisborne* and at its poorest in *Swellfoot the Tyrant*. It is not altogether a small point that this poem contains his first touch of what may be called the sportive grotesque. According to Ruskin, (*Stones of Venice* III, iii) the essence of grotesque is to hold in check the terror of evil so as to play with it. The definition might be made to cover every artistic presentation of terrible things; and in this wider sense the rotting garden in *The Sensitive Plant* (March, 1820) has more than a little of the gift which Browning has used in his *Childe Roland*. But to be both earnest and merry in presence of the evil or the hideous was a gain in the power of comedy (and that is in the power of life) which had been long in coming. In the summer of 1816 Shelley had rushed out of a company of friends in intense horror at the vision of 'a woman with eyes in her breasts' looking at him from over the balustrade of a staircase; and in the fair copy of *The Witch* at the Bodleian Library the sudden unsteadiness of the handwriting after the rejected line about 'monophthalmic Polyphemes' tells a like tale¹. But the words are replaced in the text by the still stronger line of the

lumps neither alive nor dead,
Dog-headed, bosom-eyed, and bird-footed (135, 136).

¹ Medwin, I 257. On the unsteady writing in the fair copy see Mr Locock's *Examination of the Shelley Manuscripts in the Bodleian*, p. 18.

Indeed, throughout his Italian period the sense of new powers germinating and still to ripen, while it heartened Shelley against the cold of popular criticism, kept him at the same time drifting in poetry from one experiment to another. Like *The Witch of Atlas*, *Swellfoot the Tyrant*, *Epipsychidion* and *Adonais* were all struck off quickly on chance-flung motives, and the one work at which he thought and laboured persistently—the drama of *Charles the First*—would not come right. He was trying his powers; sometimes with a doubt whether he might not be wasting them in the process, whether, as he wrote to Medwin (July 20, 1820), 'the attempt to excel in many ways does not debar from excellence in one particular kind¹, but always trusting again in his future. *The Witch*, as he protests to Mary in the opening verses, is a promissory work; the kitten may be suffered to play 'till its claws come.' It may be, as Professor Woodberry supposes², that had he lived he would have created a religious drama in the style of Calderon. Perhaps it is a nearer guess, bearing in mind *The Triumph of Life*, that his chief master would have been Dante rather, and his finest medium the allegorical vision, tinged with grotesque and not a little with satire. To this kind *The Witch of Atlas*, *The Mask of Anarchy* and the great fragment of 1822 belong together, though the first is marked off from the other two by special differences. For *The Witch of Atlas* is an allegory; but one so cunningly framed that there is but a delicate translucence of the inner truth, and no more than a faint suffusion of sorrow in what is else the most clear-hearted of Shelley's songs.

And in this also, in the infusion of a philosophic import, the poem is characteristic. It was Shelley's way to be pre-occupied with truth and to dress it in his art in the shows of life; whereas the other kind of poet sees truth only as embedded in things, and perhaps without disengaging it at all. Yet with this conceptual frame of mind Shelley could never complain, as Schiller used to do, of being deficient in phantasy, such is the crowd of images from books and from life swept together into this poem by the wind of inspiration. The germ of his idea lay, perhaps, in the stanzas of the *Faerie Queene* which tell of the wanton Phædria in her 'litle gondelay' on the Idle Lake (II, vi 3).

And therein sate a Ladie fresh and fayre
 Making sweet solace to her selfe alone:
 Sometimes she song as lowd as larke in ayre
 Sometimes she laught that nigh her breth was gone:

¹ Cf. what he said to Trelawny of the *Cenci* being an experiment, and of the advisability of 'keeping to one style,' *Records*, ch. ix.

² See the Introduction to his edition of selected poems.

Yet was there not with her else any one,
That might to her move cause of meriment :
Matter of merth enough, though there were none,
She could devise, and thousand waies invent
To feede her foolish humour and vaine jolliment ;

(cf. especially *W. A.* XXI); and she laughs to see the pinnacle cleave the waters, like Shelley's Witch amid the fire-balls of the air. Purified of all evil, the Lady of the Boat becomes, like Urania in the *Adonais*, 'the better genius of the world's estate.' Like Spenser's Belphebe and Amoretta, again, she is conceived miraculously by a Nymph of the rays of the Sun¹. Like Urania, or like the Spirit of the Earth in *Prometheus Unbound* (III, iv 33 f.), who also could lurk at the bottom of a fountain, she walked among men 'while they slept and she unseen' (*P. U.* III, iv 50), noting them with joy or pain. In July 1820 Shelley turned the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* into English in the same easy lilt of the *ottava rima* in which a month later he sang of the Witch: and throughout the *fantasia* there is a sort of afterglow from that old and happy tale. The Nymph Maia bears her son to Zeus in a cave

μακάρων δὲ θεῶν ἡλείαθ' ὄμιλον,
ἄντρον ἔσω ναίονσα παλίσκιον, ἔνθα Κρονίων
νύμφῃ εὐπλοκάμφῳ μισγέσκειτο νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ.

('She shunned the assembly of the blessed Gods, dwelling within a shadowy cave, where the Son of Kronos was wont to embrace the fair-tressed Nymph in the deep of night'—Mr Andrew Lang's Translation.) There are 'tripods' in the cave and 'store of cauldrons' (ll. 60, 61; cf. *W. A.* xx), and when Apollo enters the dwelling,

παπτήνας δ' ἄρα πάντα μυχὸν μεγάλῳ δόμοιο
τρῆς ἀδύτους ἀνέωγε λαβῶν κληίδα φαεῖνῃν
νέκταρος ἐμπλείους ἥδ' ἀμβροσίης ἐρατεινῆς·
πολλὸς δὲ χρυσός τε καὶ ἄργυρος ἔνδον ἔκειτο,
πολλὰ δὲ φοινικέοντα καὶ ἄργυφα εἴματα νύμφης,
οἷα θεῶν μακάρων ἱεροὶ δόμοι ἐντὸς ἔχουσιν. (246—251)

('Gazing round all the chamber of the vasty dwelling, he opened three aumbries with the shiny key; full were they of nectar and glad ambrosia, and much gold and silver lay within, and much raiment of the Nymph, purple and glistening, such as are within the dwellings of the mighty gods')². And so the Atlas Nymph is begotten in the

¹ The parallel has been remarked by T. Böhme in *Spenser's Einfluss auf Shelley*, Berlin Dissertation, 1909.

² These are not the only touches from the Hymn. The ll. 43—46:—'And as a swift thought wings through the breast of one whom crowding cares are haunting...so swiftly devised Hermes both deed and word'—are magically echoed in *W. A.* 319 (cf. the *Hymn*

cave, and lives there apart from the other Gods; and so (for her as elsewhere in Shelley the Greek myth suffers a change and 'puts on incorruption') the nectar and gold of Maia are converted into visions, thought-stirring odours, and death-defeating elixirs (*W. A.* xv f.). Mr Locock in his recent edition of the poems has pointed out that the woodland deities who attend the Lady are suggested by the description of these beings gathering around Una in the *Fuërie Queene* (I, vi 7 ff.), who

[In] wonder of her beautie soverayne
Are wonne with pittie and unwonted ruth¹.

There is again an echo of the Homeric Hymns in the incident of the animals that join her train. In the *Hymn to Aphrodite* the Goddess comes to Ida attended by the beasts which she controls by her power:—

οἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν
σαίνοντες πολιοὶ τε λύκοι χαροποί τε λέοντες,
ἄρκτοι, παρδάλιές τε βοαὶ προκάδων ἀκόρητοι
ἦσαν· ἡ δ' ὀρώσασα μετὰ φρεσὶ τέρπετο θυμὸν,
καὶ τοῖς ἐν στήθεσσι βάλ' ἤμερον. (69—73; cf. *W. A.* vi f.)

('Behind her came fawning the beasts, grey wolves, and lions fiery-eyed, and bears, and swift pards, insatiate pursuers of the roe-deer. Glad was she at the sight of them, and sent desire into their breasts.') Aphrodite also has 'glistering garments' εἴματα σιγαλόεντα, 85 f.,

κάλλος δὲ παρειάων ἀπέλαμπεν
ἄμβροτον, οἷόν τ' ἐστὶν εὖστεφάνου Κυθερείης.
(174, 175; cf. *W. A.* xii f.)

('From her cheeks shined forth immortal beauty.') The pictures of the fabulous Egypt may be a garnished version of some passages in the second book of Herodotus, where much is said of Mœris and the Labyrinth and King Amasis. The picture of boys riding tame crocodiles had long been familiar to Shelley in Landor's *Gebir* (IV, 165, 166):—

Crowned were tame crocodiles, and boys white-robed
Guided their creaking crests across the stream;

to the *Pythian Apollo* 8, 9). And, by the bye, who that has studied Shelley's way with Greek poetry of beating out and enamelling its phrases will refuse to see in ll. 97, 98,

ὄρφναι ὃ' ἐπικούρος ἐπαύετο δαμονίῃ νύξ,
ἡ πλείων, τάχα δ' ὄρθρος ἐγένετο δημοσεργός

('Then stayed for the more part his darkling ally, the sacred Night, and swiftly came morning when men can work'), the germ of the verses in *The Boat on the Serchio* and *The Triumph of Life*, in which the dawn calls men to labour? Dowden has suggested that the frolic tone in *The Witch* was due to Shelley's recent perusal of the burlesque epic *Ricciardetto* by the Italian poet Fortiguerra. The Homeric Hymns will account for the tone, and there is nothing else in Fortiguerra to remind us of *The Witch*, unless it be that in *Ricciardetto* ix 83, a witch can turn into a frog and live at the bottom of a well, and in xxv 35 f., another sorceress summons all kinds of savage beasts and monsters around her.

¹ The coincidence is also noticed by Böhme, *op. cit.*

and he may have remembered the juggler on the crocodile in the Towneley marbles of the British Museum¹. In the *Faerie Queene* the priests of Isis, all dressed alike in 'linnen robes with silver hemd' and moon-shaped mitres, sleep on the earth round the image of their deity (v, vii 4 ff.; cf. *W. A.* LXIV). Perhaps, too, memories of life mingled with these others from books. As a boy at Eton, Shelley would have seen in Dr Lind's study 'a curious book representing every part of a Chinese monastery, buildings, utensils, gods, priests, and idols; very neatly and most elaborately executed, and the colours uncommonly vivid' (Account of a visit to Dr Lind in Miss Burney's *Diary*, ed. Austen Dobson, II, 339). May it not be that, if there was a dormitory in the book, the rows of Chinese faces, all alike (*W. A.* LXIV), made a fast impression on him? As to the Antarctic scenery², I would hazard a guess that at some time or other Shelley went skating on an Alpine lake, and drew his imagery from that experience. 'I daresay,' he writes to Medwin from Florence in January 1820, 'the lake before you is a plain of solid ice, bounded by the snowy hills, whose white mantles contrast with the aerial rose-colour of the eternal glaciers—a scene more grand, yet like the recesses of the Antarctic circle. If your health allows you to skate, this plain is the floor of your Paradise, and the white world seems spinning backwards as you fly.' Gather these memories together, and you have most of the incident of the poem. The main theme, however, the heart-sorrow of the lonely Nymph, who, being immortal, cannot exchange love with mortal creatures, is taken once more from the Homeric Hymns. The bitter drop in the cup of Aphrodite, when she loves Anchises, is the thought that his beauty must pass away, and therewith her love. 'If, being such as thou art in beauty and form, thou couldst live on, and be called my lord, then this grief would not overshadow my heart. But it may not be, for swiftly will pitiless old age come upon thee...Deep and sore hath been my folly, and distraught have

¹ The image was present to his mind in *The Mask of Anarchy*, where

Like Sidmouth, next, Hypocrisy
On a crocodile rode by. (Stanza ix.)

² At the risk of falling into the obvious temptation in this kind of study I would suggest that Shelley may also have been thinking of Lewis's Oriental tale *Amorassan, or The Spirit of the Frozen Ocean*. Two aspects of the story come into account: (a) The Spirits of the Just and Pure live in an aerial pavilion on Mount Caucasus, and the walls of the pavilion are hung with pictures representing the progress of all good and evil deeds on earth, at sight of which the spirits now rejoice and now mourn; cf. *W. A.* LII f. (b) The Spirit of the Frozen Ocean has the power of seeing the motives of men, and when called upon reveals them with pitiless truth. She is a female spirit of great but cold beauty, who lives in some indefinite Arctic island. In the tale she appears at the Court of an Eastern Potentate, after a false sentence has been pronounced, and indicates the real criminal.

I been who carry a child beneath my girdle, the child of a mortal man' (*Hymn to Aphrodite*, 241 f.). Thus the visions came homing to Shelley's call; but he called them to shadow forth a law of life, a truth that he held, not only in terms of desire and pain, but in intellectual terms as well.

The truth is so wrapped up in its images that some critics refuse to see it at all. 'It seems to me,' says Mr Clutton-Brock, 'one of those poems in which Shelley wrote about all the things that pleased him most, and of which the subject was a mere pretext for doing so.' It is hardly surprising that most readers, from Mary onwards, have found here 'a lack of human interest,' and a supreme example of the cold brilliance which is imputed to the poet. Shelley rejoins boldly to this criticism in the prefatory lines *To Mary*. His wife seems to have been holding up Wordsworth as an example¹. 'Well,' he answers in effect, 'take *Peter Bell*. That is what you would call an actual and human poem; I call it lifeless, a thing of saws and instances. In my *ethereal Witch* the life flows free as the metre in which I sing of her; see into her real Nature, and she will appeal, not to your moral sentiment, but to love and passion.' And passion, in the high and importunate mode of it which Shelley knew in himself, is plainly a part of the theme. The *Witch*, like the youth in *Alastor*, is smitten with a quenchless thirst for a love which earth cannot give her. Were she of the earth she might find a mate; but she is immortal and so alone. So she creates the *Hermaphrodite* for her solace. The *Hermaphrodite* appears to stand for the Imagination, the faculty which brings the world into harmony and in which all oppositions are reconciled, fire and snow, male and female. It is a fair companion, but it cannot bring the *Witch* heartsease². Again, many critics from Swinburne onwards have agreed that the *Lady* represents that *anima mundi* which is the alpha and omega of Shelley's faith. Her presence is felt from end to end of *Nature*; she must shroud her glory from sight, as Prometheus bids Asia do; she is the beneficent humour in the body of things. Here, then, is a seeming contradiction. On the one hand she is a symbol of the idealistic mind, of natures like Shelley's own, fraught in this life with a tragic insatiability. Such minds turn to art for an

¹ She had apparently preached Byron's example as well. The expression 'the purest sky, Where the swan sings amid the Sun's dominions' (ll. 11, 12) recalls the 'tempest-cleaving Swan of Albion' in the *Lines written among the Euganean Hills*.

² Shelley, writing to Hogg, Dec. 3, 1812, applies the word 'hermaphroditical,' along with other opprobrious terms, to the unfortunate Miss Hitchener. We may infer that the idea 'Hermaphrodite' was bound up in his mind with the significance 'unfeeling, incapable of returning love.'

embodiment of their ideal; and perhaps the magic boat, which could not contain the fires of Venus and so was bought by Apollo, or, as others feign, grew from a seed planted and tended by Cupid in his Mother's star (xxxif.), stands for the art which is inspired by love but cannot satisfy it. Shelley seldom imagines a river without thinking of it allegorically. In *Mont Blanc* the torrent of the Arve reminds him of the race of thought and impression in the human mind; and the forest stream in *Alastor* (502 ff.) calls up the same image to the wanderer. Asia in the *Prometheus* (II, v 72 ff.) dreams that she embarks with her lover in a boat that floats down a river past crags, whirlpools, and caverns to an immeasurable sea. The river, as the poet proceeds to explain, is the River of Life; the crags and whirlpools are the moral dangers of youth and age; the sea is Eternity. The Witch of Atlas was probably floating down the same stream with her Hermaphrodite. When they follow the stream's course the Hermaphrodite is more or less dormant; which means, perhaps, that the objective art, the art which describes life as it comes, is not the fullest exercise of the Imagination; but when the Witch will speed up stream to the sources of the river (that is, when the mind turns to the high contemplative art), the Hermaphrodite must wake and use all the power of his wings. On the other hand the Witch is not only the human idealist, but no less distinctly the Divine Principle. The solution of the difficulty seems to be provided by the lyric just referred to in the *Prometheus Unbound*. Beyond a doubt that lyric is an allegory; and it will admit of no interpretation unless we can see in Asia (so far as these lines go) not the Divinity in general, but the Divinity in Man, as 'piloted' by Man, sharing his course, and working through his actions. Prometheus having freed himself, Asia can join him, and together they will escape the perils of youth and age and attain to Eternity, which in Shelley means a certain mode of holiness (II. 98 f.). Just as in the *Prometheus* Asia is now the Divine Love in all the world and now the spark of it in Man, so in *The Witch of Atlas* the poet passes without warning from the larger aspect to the smaller. The more of the divine there is in a man, the more will he thirst for love and miss the full fruition of it. Nay, the Divine Spirit throughout Nature is conscious of the same want. Must the Spirit, then, for ever suffer in this mystery of pain? The answer is not given in *The Witch of Atlas*, but it is given frequently elsewhere by Shelley, and belongs to the root of his philosophy. The Divinity, and we as parts of it, suffer a sort of Fall by entering Time or Nature, by

undergoing 'the eclipsing curse of birth.' But the Spirit may one day slough off Time and Nature, and withdraw again to its transcendental self, in which is all fulness. There the light of being will be no more broken and depreciated by the dome of many-coloured glass which Death tramples to fragments. Thus the poem is quick with that sublimation of the sexual desire which Shelley has somewhere called 'the wine of life'; though there are many who cannot bring their lips to the drink for the strangeness of the cup. And it is a deliberate sentence which he passes on Wordsworth in comparing his own poem with *Peter Bell*. In Wordsworth, he thought (cf. *Peter Bell the Third*, IV, xif.), that wine of life is scant and thin.

A. M. D. HUGHES.

KIEL.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

THE ORIGINAL 'ROMEO AND JULIET.'

I think it has not yet been noted by Shakspearean students that Arthur Brooke, the author of *The Tragicall Historie of Romeus and Juliet* (published by Richard Tottell on Nov. 19, 1562) was concerned in the production of plays at the Inner Temple at Christmas, 1561. The entry (to which I was courteously given access at the Treasurer's Office of the Inn) is part of the proceedings of a Parliament of the Inn held on Feb. 4, 1562, and runs thus:

Item y^t arthur broke shall have a spiall admittance w^tout anything paying in consideration of certen playes & showes in chrm^e last, set forth by hym.

In the preface to his poem Brooke said that he had seen the same argument 'lately set foorth on stage with more commendation, then I can looke for: (being there much better set forth then I have or can dooe).' It seems likely that the tragedy Brooke had in mind was produced at one of the Inns of Court, for it was, of course, before the days of the regular theatres, and all the four early classical tragedies that have survived were so produced, *Gorboduc* and *Gismond of Salerne* at the Inner Temple, *Jocasta* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* at Gray's Inn. It is possible that this early *Romeo and Juliet* was presented at the Inner Temple at Christmas, 1561, and that this drew Brooke's attention to the subject; the terms of his reference seem to imply that he was not the author of the tragedy. It is true that there is no mention of any such play in the records of the Inner Temple, but neither is there of *Gorboduc*, which we know was presented there at that time. Inderwick says (*A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records*): 'There are no entries, in our now existing records, of any particular play in our own hall before the reign of James I.'

My suggestion is little more than speculation, but it may be pardoned in view of the absence of known facts. Two theories on the subject may be said to hold the field. Hunter (*New Illustrations of Shakespeare*, vol. II, p. 130) and Courthope (*History of English Poetry*, vol. IV, p. 100) suggest that Brooke referred to a Latin tragedy among the Sloane MSS. in the British Museum. Dr Harold de W. Fuller

(*Modern Philology*, vol. iv, pp. 75—120), after a careful examination of the Latin tragedy, is of opinion that it was based on Brooke, and was probably written by a Cambridge student after 1605. Dr Fuller's theory is that Brooke refers to an English play, composed between 1559 and 1562, and now represented by a Dutch version entitled *Romeo en Juliette*. There is, of course, no conflict between Dr Fuller's theory and the suggestion now made.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE.

NEW YORK.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'ROISTER.'

The accepted etymology, from Fr. *rustre*, Lat. *rusticus*, is based on Cotgrave's gloss for *rustre*, 'a ruffin, *royster*, hackester, swaggerer; sawcie, paultry, scurvy fellow.' It seems to me out of the question to identify this *rustre* with Lat. *rusticus*, which would rather be explained as 'a clowne, boore, churle, hob, hinde, swayne, lobcock, rude or unmannerly lozell' (Cotgrave's gloss to *rustault*). Littré quotes from Brantôme, s.v. *rustre*, 'D'autres les ont appelez *rustres* (certains soldats) ainsi que nous lisons dans le roman de M. de Bayard, que M. de Bayard dit à ses *rustres*, appellan(s) ainsi ceux auxquels il commandoit.' This passage is possibly the origin of Cotgrave's *rustre*. Now the original of *roister* ought to be something of the nature of a *Miles gloriosus* or *Franç Archier de Bagnolet*, for the verb to *roist*, a back-formation from *roister*, is rendered *jactare* by the Latin dictionaries of the seventeenth century. I propose *reister*, a horse-soldier, bravo, a common word in seventeenth century English, from Fr. *reistre*, 'a *reister*, or swart-rutter, a German horseman' (Cotgrave). This *reistre*, now *reître*, is Ger. *Reiter*, with intrusive *s*. In sixteenth century French it occurs commonly in the sense of mercenary ruffian, and is so far associated with *routier* (from *route*, band) that *un vieux reître* and *un vieux routier* are interchangeable terms for an old soldier with the implied meaning of desperado. From about 1450 to 1750 Ger. *Reiter* is generally replaced by *Reuter*, 'a *reiter* or *reister*' (Ludwig, 1715), cf. Du. *ruiter*. Kluge regards the Dutch word as ultimately identical with Fr. *routier*, but Franck dissents. However that may be, the earliest form of the Dutch word is *rûter*, and, as we have Fr. *reistre* from Ger. *Reiter*, it seems reasonable to accept Fr. *rustre* from Du. *rûter* or from the early German form *rûter* (Weigand). This would explain Cotgrave's gloss to *rustre* and also the meaning of the English word, which, I fancy, owes more to *reister* than to *rustre*; for the vowel change cf. *boil* for *bile*. The

intrusive *s* of the two French words *reistre* and *rustre* is to be explained by the influence of such Renaissance spellings as *maistre*, *traistre*, etc. It is true that in such words the *s* does not usually affect the sound, but we have a parallel to the sounded *s* of *reistre*, *rustre* in Fr. *flibustier*, earlier *fribustier*, from Du. *vrybuiter*, freebooter.

ERNEST WEEKLEY.

NOTTINGHAM.

A HERRICK READING.

Herrick's 'Dean-bourn, a rude River in Devon by which sometimes he lived' is one of the best known of the *Hesperides* poems, but what is by no means so well known is that almost every modern editor of Herrick's works, from Hazlitt and Grosart onwards, has seen fit to tamper with the text. As a consequence, Professor Boas in his otherwise most friendly review of my life of Herrick (*Mod. Lang. Rev.* vol. VII, p. 382) took me rather severely to task for introducing what seemed to him a grotesque misquotation of the poem,—in reality a restoration of the original text. In the original edition the first two verses read as follows:

Dean-bourn, farewell; I never look to see
Deane, or thy warty incivility.

In modern editions 'watry' or 'watery' is substituted for 'warty,' and the force of the whole poem is thereby impaired. A study of the succeeding verses will, I think, make this clear. They read as follows:

Thy rockie bottome, that doth teare thy streams,
And makes them frantick, ev'n to all extreames;
To my content, I never sho'd behold,
Were thy streames silver, or thy rocks all gold.
Rockie thou art; and rockie we discover
Thy men; and rockie are thy wayes all over.

It will be seen that what Herrick objects to in Dean Burn is its rockiness. The whole poem turns upon this, and with the rockiness of the stream's bed he compares the rockiness of the ways of the people who live by it. Now the use of the word 'warty,' in the sense of rocky, in l. 2, seems to me not only justifiable, but highly characteristic of the poet. Moreover, 'watry incivility,' if read in the light of the poem as a whole, is meaningless. The incivility of the stream in Herrick's eyes consists, not in its wateriness, but in its 'wartiness': what he would have liked would have been more water and fewer 'warts.' And I, who have known Dean Burn since my childhood, am inclined to agree with him.

F. W. MOORMAN.

LEEDS.

DISCUSSIONS.

THE NAME OF THE LETTER 3.

The remarkably thorough and able investigations of Miss A. C. Paues (*Modern Language Review*, October, 1911) have proved that the form *yok*, occurring in one MS. of the northern English version of *Mandeville*, is an incorrect representation of the name by which the letter 3 was known in the fourteenth century, and that the original name was 303.

I think, however, that the hypothesis which Miss Paues has propounded with regard to the ultimate origin of the name is untenable. She regards 303 as a later form of *eah*, the name of the thirteenth rune of the Anglian futhorc. Her supposition is that when the Angles learned the Roman letters from the Irish missionaries, they were struck by the resemblance in shape between the letter G (in Irish handwriting) and the thirteenth letter of their native alphabet, and that on this account they adopted *eah* as their name for the Roman letter. It is conceded that the original sound of the rune, whatever it may have been, had been forgotten, the various phonetic values with which the rune is used in three inscriptions being mere inferences from its traditional name.

Now it is quite inconceivable that the Irish missionaries, when they taught the Roman alphabet to their English converts, confined their teaching to the forms of the letters and the sounds which they expressed, leaving their pupils to provide names for them according to their own fancy. Surely a foreign alphabet was never taught in this inconvenient fashion. The shapes of the letters and their traditional names together always form the first stage of instruction; their use in representing sounds has to be learned afterwards. I do not know that we have any information as to the names by which the Roman letters were called in England before the Norman Conquest. But it is highly probable that the English used the same set of names that were current in the rest of the world, of course modified in pronunciation according to English habits of articulation. The alphabetic name of G would accordingly be *gē*, which at the end of the O.E. period would be pronounced nearly like the modern English word *yea*.

It might perhaps be contended that when instruction in reading and writing had passed from the hands of foreigners into those of natives, the schoolmasters may have chosen to discard the Latin names of the letters, and replace them by English names of their own invention. Something of this kind seems actually to have been done in Ireland. There is, however, no evidence that the English did set aside the

Roman letter-names which they must once have been taught. But if they had done so, they would presumably have followed the 'acrologic' principle of nomenclature; i.e., they would have chosen a set of English words beginning with the letters that were to be named. If they were influenced by the runic tradition, they would have called the letter G either *gifu* or *gār*; if they preferred to be independent of it, they might have called it *gold* or *geat*. But it is against all analogy to suppose that they would adopt *eo*h as the name of G, merely because the *shape* of the Roman letter had some resemblance to that of the character called *eo*h in the futhorc. The inconvenience of having a letter-name that has no relation to the sound is sometimes tolerated when a traditional name (e.g., our 'aitch' or 'wy') has lost its original phonetic appropriateness owing to sound change, or when a new letter has arisen out of an old one through functional and formal differentiation (so 'double-U' and the Italian 'I lungo' for J); but such anomalies have never been deliberately created. We may be sure that so long as the letter *ƿ* was in actual use the Greeks did not call it 'digamma.'

Miss Paues's hypothesis must therefore, I think, be dismissed from consideration. The true explanation of the origin of the name ȝ, in my opinion, not difficult to discover.

The history of the symbol ȝ (which was merely a less careful variant of ȝ, the Old English form of the letter *g*) is perfectly well known. Late in the twelfth century certain Englishmen, who had been taught to read and write French but not their native language, essayed to write English books in the French script and in a phonetic spelling that would be intelligible to persons whose education was similar to their own. They were met by the difficulty that English had several sounds that did not exist in French, and therefore could not be correctly expressed in French orthography. Two of these sounds, the guttural and the palatal voiced spirant, had in O.E. been expressed by the letter G, which also stood for the two sounds that it had in French. Some Middle English scribes used the ordinary French form of *g* for all the four sounds which the letter had represented in O.E. But this must often have been a stumbling-block to their readers, and other scribes, better advised, revived the old insular form of the letter in its two spirant values. The result was that ȝ was added as a new letter to the French alphabet as used in writing English.

The new letter required a name. Miss Paues is quite right in saying that it would have been natural to adopt the Old English name, and perhaps some persons did so, for there seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the genuineness of the 'ye' of the Trinity MS. Other persons, however, preferred to call the letter ȝ, which had the advantage of indicating both its phonetic values at once. I feel little doubt that the suggestion came from the word ȝoȝ (youth), and it is not impossible that this word was at first employed unabbreviated as an alphabetic name.

HENRY BRADLEY.

ENGLISH METRIC.

Had not Mr Rudmose-Brown's criticism of my *Essai sur les Principes de la Métrique anglaise* appeared in so distinguished a periodical as *The Modern Language Review*¹, I should not have thought it worth while to reply to his gross misrepresentations. But to such as have not read the book, his censure of it may seem to be just. Therefore, after much hesitation, I have at last resolved on attempting an answer.

First of all, I must appeal to the reader's forbearance. My *Métrique anglaise* was conceived and almost entirely written a good many years ago, and from that time I have given up English studies for other pursuits. I am afraid the style and language of this article will prove to be awkward and deficient, if not faulty.

My bulky essay consists of three parts, the purport of which is clearly shown by their respective titles: in Vol. I, *Métrique auditive*, I tried to ascertain the laws and forms of English rhythm by ear; in Vol. II, *Théorie générale du rythme*, I investigated the nature, perception, origin and evolution of rhythm and metre, with special reference to English poetry; in Vol. III, *Notes de métrique expérimentale*, I resorted to experimental phonetics in order to analyze a few samples of English prose and verse, as delivered by Mme Duclaux (Mary Robinson), the well-known English poetess, Mr La., an English and German master in an English public school, and Mr Le., an English man of letters. At the very outset, Mr Rudmose-Brown asserts that all my arguments are drawn from Mr La.'s and Mr Le.'s pronunciation, which *a priori* he discards with insulting haughtiness ("the pronunciation of the man in the street," "the garbling of two Toms or Dicks," p. 231), or from "the rendering of a distinguished foreigner," M. Beljame (p. 231). This, he cannot but know, is untrue. In the first two volumes, as far as regards modern English verse—though I occasionally referred in a foot-note to my records as corroborating mere auditory observation—I only depended on the pronunciation I have heard from the lips of my English friends, most of whom belong to literary families, are cultivated people, with a sensitive ear for poetry, and in every sense "educated and artistically competent" Englishmen (p. 231—cf. e.g. I, p. 125). M. Beljame I fairly often quoted: Mr Rudmose-Brown infers that I blindly rely on "M. Beljame's aid"; Professor Saintsbury, that my book seems to have been "planned almost as a direct polemic against the late M. Alexandre Beljame" (*History of English Prosody*, III, p. 466). It is obvious that one at least must be wrong. In fact, both are. In order to avoid idle discussions on the pronunciation of my examples, I endeavoured as often as possible to choose lines on the accentuation of which I fully agree with champions of traditional metric, such as Mr Abbott, Mr Mayor, and especially M. Beljame, who was to be my

¹ Vol. VI (1911), pp. 230—240. References to his article will be easily distinguished from those to my book because the latter are always preceded by the indication of the volume (I, II, or III). All remarks of mine inside quotations are put between square brackets.

examiner, and whose little treatise on English verse is widely used in France—Professor Saintsbury highly commends his knowledge and pronunciation of English (*l. c.* p. 467). But whether I agree with these metrists or not, I alone am responsible for the pronunciation indicated; and I do not see that Mr Rudmose-Brown ever takes exception to my “stress-accents”: he only objects to my advocacy of isochronism and my scansions.

According to his criticism, it would seem that my book was only or mostly concerned with isochronism. The headings of the chapters and sub-chapters would suffice to show that this is not so. I minutely analyzed the sounds, syllabication, accents, quantities, intonations, rhythms, rhymes and metres of the English language. Even if the theory of isochronism be rejected, nearly the whole of the first volume will none the less hold good. This also applies to the scansion which I support: it divides verse into *bars* (“measures,” “feet”) *measured from beat to beat* (“ictus,” “*temps marqué*”). Any other scansion chops the lines into irreconcilable fragments, i.e. fragments which often have nothing in common, neither the position of the beat nor the number of the syllables.

Mr Rudmose-Brown will no doubt protest against this assertion, which he ascribes to my ignoring “alternation.” I do not ignore it. I have explained how all speech tends to alternation (I, pp. 53—62, II, pp. 96—101), the English language to binary alternation—i.e. weak, strong, weak, strong, etc. (*ib.*, and especially I, § 200)—which binary alternation is the basis of English rhythm, as well in prose as in verse. The metre of heroic verse I represent as alternating¹:

A lance that splinter'd like an *icicle*.
w s w s w s w s w s

But Mr Rudmose-Brown's “alternation” is something more refined and subtle. To ordinary mortals, alternation means the regular recurrence of one thing after another. To Mr Rudmose-Brown, it means a promiscuous and disorderly alternation of different degrees of either stress or pitch, i.e. now of strong (s) with weak (w), now of high (h) with low (l). In his scansion of the following lines the “ictus” (') is marked either by “stress-accent” (s) or by “pitch-accent” (h) indiscriminately:

Suddenly *flásh'd* on *hér* a *wíld* *desíre*.
l h w s w s w s w s
This *précíous* *stóne* set in the *sílver* *seá*.
w s w s l h w s w s
Ruggéd and *dárk*, *wíndíng* *ámóng* the *spríngs*.
l h w s l h w s w s
Take *yóur* *ówn* *tíme*, *Anníe*, take *yóur* *ówn* *tíme*.
l h w s l h l h w s

First of all, I doubt very much if his analysis of pitch is correct². Let us grant it. But by what mystery can the ear, without any warning,

¹ s=strong (syllable), a syllable which receives the beat, i.e. a relative increase of force or intensity; w=weak (syllable), any other syllable. The position of the beat in the line is indicated by italics.

² Cf. Verrier, *Questions de Métrique anglaise*, Paris, 1912, 6, Rem. I.

recognize the mark of ictus now in stress, now in pitch,—especially as the stronger syllable in any of the groups ‘weak + strong’ may at the same time be the lower? The “ictus” in this scansion is only indicated by the order of the syllables: it recurs with every other syllable. How, then, am I to discover in the following lines that it falls, not on ‘-ly,’ ‘-ble’ and ‘-cent,’ but on ‘rang,’ ‘cry’ and ‘soul’?

So thése were wéd and mérrily ráng the bélls.
He sént abróad a shríll and térrible crý.
The líttle ínnocent sóul flittéd awáy.

And what of this line—

The sóund of mány a héavily gálloping hóof—?

It might be argued that the ear was guided by there being no increase of force, or rise of pitch, or lengthening of sound in ‘-ly,’ ‘-ble,’ ‘-cent,’ etc., when compared with the syllable respectively preceding. In fact there is, not only one or the other, but generally all three together, so that the ear may well mistake this triple reinforcement for an “ictus” and feel somewhat at a loss on finding that the next syllable is not followed by a higher or stronger one, as ‘beat’ is in

But néver mérrilý beat Ánnie’s héart.

Anyhow, the “alternation” is destroyed: we no longer have “ictus, no ictus, ictus,” but “ictus, no ictus, no ictus, ictus.”

Mr Rudmose-Brown sees the difficulty, and he is ready with an explanation: “The word ‘merrily’ in the first line is intended to be read as a dissyllable” (p. 236, note 1). Does he really pronounce ‘merr’ly,’ ‘terr’ble,’ etc.? If a Scotchman, he can perhaps manage it. In fact nobody *does* maim the words in this way. How, then—again—can we hear where the “ictus” appears, if it is not indicated by the position of the syllable, but either by force or pitch promiscuously?

Not only is it impossible to understand how rhythm might be indiscriminately determined now by stress and now by pitch, but it has been proved by Mr Herbert Woodrow’s scientific experiments that rhythm has nothing whatever to do with pitch, except as far as pitch is an element of force (*Psychological Review*, xviii, 1911, pp. 54—77). The ictus, therefore, is only marked by an increase of force, and the lines are to be scanned in this way:

So these were wed and merrily rang the bells.
w s w s w s w w s w s
Suddenly flash’d on her a wild desire.
s w w s w s w s w s (s)
The little innocent soul flitted away.
w s w s w w s s w w s
Rugged and dark, winding among the springs¹.
s w w s s w w s w s

¹ I scan Shelley’s line in this way,—not “because...it matches part of Swinburne’s real greater asclepiad,

Áh! thy lúminous éyes! Ónce was their líght féd with the fire of dáy.”
(p. 236, note 2), but because its rhythm requires it,

It is perfectly true that in the first line the three syllables of 'merrily' only count as two: they only take up the time of a regular dissyllabic bar. But this would mean nothing whatever if that time were not fixed, i.e. if the bars of the line were not isochronous. And if rhythm does not rest on isochronism, it rests on nothing—it does not exist: in the above lines there is no other constant regularity but isochronism.

To my mind, therefore, and to that of nearly all English metrists, English verse is always accentual: the strong syllables are strong by reason of their stress, be they never so slightly stressed in comparison with the weak ones.

As already pointed out, I am far from denying alternation in English poetry, e.g. in the 'metre' of heroic verse. But I cannot acknowledge two different English rhythms: one "accentual," the other "alternating." It would be strange for any versification to be based upon two "entirely different" principles (p. 231). And such is not the case with English verse. That the rhythm is not always alternating in actual heroic lines has been sufficiently shown by the preceding examples, where the beats are separated either by two or three syllables. In Mr Rudmose-Brown's "accentual rhythm" the ictus is signalized, not by the order of the syllables, but by full stress:

Hanging so light, and hanging so high,
On the topmost twig that looks up at the sky.

COLERIDGE, *Christabel*.

Our purses are empty, our swords are cold,
Give us glory, and blood, and gold.

SHELLEY, *The Masque of Anarchy*.

Now it very often happens in "accentual verse" that a strong syllable is not "stressed":

Beautiful exceedingly.

s w s w s w s

Is the night chilly and dark?

s w s s w w s

Christabel.

Clothed with the Bible as with light,

s w w s w s w s

And the shadows of the night.

s w s w s w s

The Masque of Anarchy.

As the "rhythm" is therefore neither "accentual" nor "alternating," or "syllabic," what is it? It no longer exists. And how can unrhythmic lines be harmonious? Mr Rudmose-Brown means this disregard of "rhythm" when he says: "Shelley ne soigne pas trop sa versification, qui échappe à toutes les règles" (*Étude comparée de la Versification française et de la Versification anglaise*, Grenoble, 1905, p. 129). This has nothing to do with the occasional disregard of metre, which I pointed out in Shelley's verse (I, pp. 206, 300): I did not impeach his rhythm, far from it.

Differences there are, of course, and very great ones sometimes, as to the force of the rhythm—differences also, and often very striking ones, with regard to alternation or syllabism. All this I note most carefully. But Mr Rudmose-Brown's distinction between an "accentual" and an "alternating" rhythm, I think it impossible to accept.

If anyone, on the other hand, "insists on confusing these two species of rhythm," viz. *rising* and *falling* (p. 232), who is it? Not I, surely, in spite of Mr Rudmose-Brown's assertion that on account of this confusion my "whole treatment of 'anacrusis' becomes the merest and most pernicious nonsense" (p. 234). Rather it is he, together with all traditional metrists. This distinction I not only lay down as an important principle (I, pp. 153—157), but I apply it whenever I find an opportunity. Mr Rudmose-Brown and traditional metrists also contend that they do. But how? Let us examine a few examples of their "rising" and "falling" rhythm (I group the symbols w and s according to the real syllable-grouping):

A ("rising")

1. I slip, I slide, I gloom, I glance.
w s w s w s w s
2. But ilk ane sits dreary, lamenting her deary.
w s w w s w w s w w s w
3. In brambly wildernesses.
w s w s w s w
4. This pretty, puny, weakly little one.
w s w s w s w s w s
5. Beautiful Paris, evil-hearted Paris.
s w w s w s w s w s w
6. Ready to spring; waiting a chance: for this.
s w w s s w w s w s

B ("falling")

7. Pansies, lilies, kingcups, daisies.
s w s w s w s w
8. Gathering up from all the lower ground.
s w w s w s w s w s
9. Heart within and God o'erhead.
s w s w s w s
10. Strong with the strength of the race to command, to obey, to endure.
s w w s w w s w w s w w s w w s (s)

The rhythm, to my ear, is purely rising in 1, purely falling in 5 and 7, in the main rising in 8, 9 and 10, in the main falling in 3 and 4, rising-falling in 2, falling-rising in 6. Who is right¹? Will Mr Rudmose-Brown object that "metrics and phonetics do not necessarily divide

¹ 4 (*Enoch Arden*), 5 (*Enone*) and 6 (*Enoch Arden*) are heroic lines; 8 (Tennyson's *Vision of Sin*) a 'trochaic' one. "On p. 201 M. Verrier shows how rising scansion disfigures certain trochaic and dactylic verses. Of course it does. Nothing is proved. No one wants to scan trochaic verse with rising scansion" (p. 236, note 1). Out of sixteen lines which I represented as disfigured by rising scansion (I, pp. 199—201), twelve are 'iambic' (I, pp. 199—201), one—according to Mr Mayor—'anapæstic' (I, p. 201), two 'mixed' or 'accentual' (I, pp. 200 and 201), and only one 'trochaic' (I, p. 199, not 201). The reader may judge how far he can rely on my critic's assertions.

speech into the same groups or in the same way" (p. 236)? Phonetics divides it in accordance with what we *hear*. If Mr Rudmose-Brown's "metrics" divides it otherwise, what is it but arbitrary dogmatism?

To him the distinction between rising and falling is in fact merely one between verse with anacrusis and verse without anacrusis. Though I observed that the anacrusis sometimes appears or disappears in the same poem—which he, to some extent, admits (p. 236)—I did not make it "a matter of moonshine" (*ib.*): in my eyes it is part of the verse as well as any other syllable, and an important part (I, § 237).

The anacrusis, or initial weak syllable of a line or a section, is compared with the following, not the preceding, syllable (I, §§ 240 and 260). There is accordingly no inconsistency on my part—as Mr Rudmose-Brown would have it (p. 232, note 3)—when I prefer to consider 'beat' as an interior anacrusis after the cæsura of this line:

But never merrily beat Annie's heart.

Mr Rudmose-Brown finds fault with my treatment not only of English but also of French verse. All metrists admit that in the singing of our old octosyllabics, the beat (*italics*) had only to coincide with the usual prose-stress (·) on the fourth and eighth syllables:

·Granz fu li ·dols, ·fort mærrimenz.

"All this is very doubtful," says Mr Rudmose-Brown (p. 237). Who but only he will deny, first, that there was a stress, in the current pronunciation of the words, on the syllables here preceded by a turned point? secondly, that in song the vowels here printed in *italics* received the beat? As both phenomena are nothing but an increase of force, it follows that in case of discrepancy between the beat and the prose-stress the latter was more or less neglected, nay, simply thrown over, and then ceased to exist (II, p. 145). This actual shifting of accent still very often occurs in modern French song, in the second stanza of the *Marseillaise*, for instance, where it even emphasizes usually mute *e's*¹:

Que ·veut cette ·horde d'es·claves,
De ·traîtres, de ·rois conju·rés.

Mr Rudmose-Brown's objection to it is the more astonishing as he himself—if I understand him correctly—wrongly requires it in the rhythm of our modern spoken verse. The following alexandrine he wants us to read in this way:

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

Why? Because a Swede (Professor Wulff), three Germans (Professors Saran, Stengel and Tobler) and an Englishman (Mr Rudmose-Brown) enjoin it? As I venture to remark in a foot-note that "comme on voit, je ne partage pas l'avis de MM. Wulff, Tobler, Stengel et Saran" (II,

¹ Common time: $\frac{4}{4} = \frac{2}{4} + \frac{2}{4}$. The first or stronger beat of the measure is indicated by **full-face**, the second or weaker beat by *italics*.

p. 142, note 3), this modest statement of my—a Frenchman's—opinion on French pronunciation is a “contemptuous dismissal” (p. 237), an “attack on Professor Saran” (p. 238). *My* opinion? Why, *all* French people, metrists and others, read thus:

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

As this is a question, not of mere scansion, but of pronunciation, we cannot but be right. At any rate, this is how we *do* pronounce and, accordingly, how we scan. Or is our verse to be scanned after a few Swedes' or Germans' and one Englishman's imaginary pronunciation? But to Mr Rudmose-Brown, our reading and scanning of our own verse is the “abomination of desolation” (p. 238). We “speak verse as if it were prose” (*ib.*). This is quite new to me: most foreigners reproach us with reciting our poetry in an artificial manner, entirely different from our usual pronunciation of prose. They say we sing our verse. And so, to some extent, we do. I really am at a loss how to understand Mr Rudmose-Brown's obloquy¹.

After referring to my statement that “aujourd'hui le rythme de nos vers repose sur l'accentuation,” he concludes: “In other words, the alexandrine has to-day the metre (more or less) of

The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold
mingled (to taste) with that of:

Thus, rolling in her burning breast, she strait to Acolia hied²,

in other words, is a hash of irreconcilable fragments” (p. 237). Our alexandrine is thus assumed to resemble—in our pronunciation and scansion—now the first line, now the second, now a section of the one coupled with a section of the other. I wonder when it can, with its twelve syllables and normal four beats, match the metre of the English septenary or fourteener. Never as a whole, of course, and hardly ever in one of its parts.

Trying to explain Professor Saran's error about French rhythm, I dared to advance that he often mistakes a more or less slight secondary stress for an ictus (II, p. 142, note 3). For one of my examples, ‘à *pe*ine un petit *nom*bre,’ I even gave a phonetic transcription in order to point out the secondary stress, namely that on ‘pe-’

¹ I may possibly propitiate him by openly confessing that I in no wise claim to be as clever as Professor Saran, who does not only invent new words, new symbols and even a new French rhythm, but also creates people out of nothing, one L. Reinach, for instance, quoted by him as being the author of *Aperçus de Métrique comparée (Der Rhythmus des französischen Verses)*, Halle, 1904, pp. 188 and 202–3). I thought I had written that article (signed L. R., i.e. Paul Verrier). Of course, I was wrong: Professor Saran knows better, as he does with regard to our pronunciation of verse. We French know nothing: we do not know how we pronounce, or how we ought to pronounce, or if we exist and under what name. I very humbly confess to it. I hope Mr Rudmose-Brown is satisfied.

² As I cannot procure the text,—which I take to be Phaer's translation of *Aeneid*, I, 50,—I have not corrected what I assume to be misprints: the comma after ‘thus,’ and ‘Acolia’ instead of ‘Aeolia.’ The line is a septenary (seven beats) or fourteener (fourteen syllables, the *o* in ‘to’ being regarded as elided and the *i* in ‘Aeolia’ as slurred).

Mr Rudmose-Brown again attacks me: "Whatever M. Verrier says, these hemistichs cannot, even in everyday prose, be pronounced without a slight stress (the least will be sufficient) on one or other of the unstressed syllables between the stresses marked" (p. 237). What else did I say? How, again, am I to understand Mr Rudmose-Brown?

Neither do I understand him when he charges me with "maligning" some verses of Shakespeare's (p. 234). He asks indignantly why they "should therefore become mere prose and be hanged forthwith" (p. 235). I only said that blank verse, owing to a frequency of weak endings and run-on lines, often becomes a sort of "prose rythmée" (I, p. 181), and I added: "Cette transformation du rythme stichique en rythme indéfini peut présenter les mêmes avantages que la substitution de la mélodie continue à la mélodie carrée dans la musique contemporaine: le rythme y gagne beaucoup en souplesse, en variété, en richesse, en ampleur." This kind of rhythm I particularly alluded to in the concluding words of my first volume: thanks to "ces transformations multiples par lesquelles il ressemble sous tant de rapports au rythme de la musique moderne," the rhythm of English poetry has become "cet admirable instrument riche en harmonies de toute sorte et si bien approprié au libre génie de la race anglaise—cette

God-gifted organ-voice of England."

If this is "maligning," I am afraid Mr Rudmose-Brown attaches to this word quite a different meaning from the usual one. Nor do I maintain that even the freest sort of blank verse is mere rhythmic prose.

A few rearranged lines of Milton (I, pp. 177 and 184) were precisely adduced in order to show that we must—especially on account of the line-cadence—"conserver à la prose rythmée du *blank verse* la division traditionnelle en vers" (I, p. 183; cf. pp. 177—178). In Vol. II, p. 217, note 1, I brought forward additional arguments to the same effect: "Ces remarques s'appliquent aussi au *blank verse*, malgré sa ressemblance avec la prose rythmée: si vague qu'en puisse devenir le mètre, comme dans les derniers drames de Shakespeare, il n'en reste pas moins par sa familiarité le fond sur lequel le poète brode ses variations, le cadre au moins subjectif dans lequel se déroule pour nous, en le débordant plus ou moins, la peinture auditive de chaque vers."

Mr Rudmose-Brown does not only give to my words or his own, but also to the technical terms of logic, quite a different meaning from the current one: "When we at last, after many preliminaries, reach the experiments on verse proper, we are brought up by the assertion, in reference to heroic verse: '*Puisque le rythme du vers est accentuel*'

¹ By concentrating our attention on weak sounds we can make them louder to our perception than strong ones, the tick of a watch, for instance, in opposition to the tick of a clock (see Wundt, *Phys. Psychol.*, 5th ed., Leipzig, 1902-3, III, p. 25). As this also applies to syllables, a prejudiced metrist will easily hear the beat of the verse in the wrong place. I suggested that such might be the case with Prof. Saran, &c. (II, p. 142, note 3). Perhaps it partially explains Mr Rudmose-Brown's illusion with regard to English "alternating rhythm."

(the italics are mine), 'le temps marqué ne saurait correspondre à un phénomène quelconque, mais seulement à un phénomène accentuel, tel que le maximum ou l'accroissement maximum de l'intensité, qui se trouvent toutes [*sic*] deux dans la voyelle'—as fine an example of *petitio principii* as one could meet with" (p. 239). What is the real fact? As an obvious reason for not regarding a certain point in initial consonants as the bearer of the ictus, I *occasionally* urged this: since (as has been demonstrated) English verse is accentual, the ictus must correspond to an accentual phenomenon, which cannot be found at the point indicated (III, p. 189, ll. 12—25). When you read in a scientific primer: "Since (as has been demonstrated) the locus consists of all the points equidistant from *A*, it can be nothing but the circumference of a circle," you surely do not call this a *petitio principii*, but a deduction. I beg the reader's pardon for fetching an illustration from mathematics, the most abstract, but also the most logical, of sciences.

I especially apologize to Mr Rudmose-Brown, who does not seem to be very much acquainted with mathematics or even with simple logic. Talking of a line, the four bars of which respectively occupy 61, 54, 56 and 52 hundredths of a second, he kindly insinuates that I divided these numbers by ten—thus getting 6, 5, 6, 5—in order to make the 'double bars' or dipodies look equal: $6 + 5 = 11$, $6 + 5 = 11$. He "must protest against M. Verrier's arithmetic" (p. 239). I beg to protest against Mr Rudmose-Brown's quite un-British notion of fair play. I only wanted to show that within certain limits—which after all might be the correct ones—those double bars are equal. The choice of a time-unit in experimental metric is as yet largely conventional. I generally use the *cs.* or centisecond (hundredth of a second), partly because my tracings or my measurements would hardly be reliable with a lower unit, such as the *ms.* or millisecond (thousandth of a second). Why not the *ds.* or decisecond (tenth of a second) as well, especially when we have longer intervals to deal with¹? And does Mr Rudmose-Brown know of any other method of converting centiseconds into deciseconds than division by ten? Which here gives $6 + 5 = 11$ *ds.* and $6 + 5 = 11$ *ds.* But—for what reason I do not know, neither does he—he insists upon having 115 *cs.* ($= 61 + 54$) and 108 *cs.* ($= 56 + 52$) or, which comes to the same, 11·5 *ds.* and 10·8 *ds.*—that is upon having the centiseconds. Unless I arrive at 115 and 115 *cs.* or 108 and 108 *cs.*, he will not be satisfied that the double bars are equal. Is he really unaware that by 115 *cs.* is meant a number between 1145·1 *ms.* and 1155·0 *ms.*, by 108 *cs.* a number between 1075·1 *ms.* and 1085·0 *ms.*, with a possible difference of 9·9 *ms.*? Where are we?

No two things are really equal: they are only equal within certain limits. Within which limits—deciseconds, centiseconds, milliseconds, etc.—must musical or poetical bars be equal? In other words, within what limits do they seem sufficiently equal to the ear? Mr Rudmose-Brown

¹ The size of the 'differential time-limen' increases with the length of the intervals (see *Psychological Review*, xviii, 1911, pp. 118—119).

neither knows nor apparently cares to know. Quoting the durations I have calculated for the bars of four lines¹—

Show me fair would scorn to spy—		
57·4	62·5	61·0
Close on the hounds the hunter came—		
50·4	49·5	45·6
Mountain and meadow, moss and moor—		
59·4	49·1	46·0
Pennons and flags defaced and stained—		
68·1	53·1	64·4

he humorously remarks: "The isochronism is not obvious to my pre-judiced mind" (p. 239). Whether obvious or not to his mind, he knows. But to his ear? He does not know. This he can only find by long, minute, and scrupulous experiments, which, of course, is much more troublesome than the off-hand statement of an arbitrary opinion. Now, even if the actual bars, with their ever-changing sound-complexes, were replaced by "accentual trochees" consisting of identical sounds—identical with regard to pitch and 'timbre'—namely those of a tuning-fork, no human ear could detect any difference of duration between the bars in each of the first two lines; and the bars of the last two—though somewhat unequal to an ear on its guard—would satisfy the demands of rhythmic isochronism. This is shown by what in experimental psychology, as well as in any other science, is called the 'relative variation' (*r. v.*): in hundredths of the 'unit' or uniform duration to which the bars of each line tend more or less approximately—i.e. their mean—their average difference from that unit is respectively 3·2, 3·9, 10·3 and 9·4, with an average of 6·7 for the four lines; according to experiments made by Mr J. E. Wallace Wallin with a tuning-fork, the differential limen is on an average 5·2 for mere difference of time (duration), 6·36 for "excellent," 8·53 for "good," 12·0 for "fairly good," 14·5 for "poor," and 17·8 for "disrupted" rhythm (*Psychological Review*, xviii, 1911, p. 107). From the fact that the rhythm improves in quality together with the approximation to absolute isochronism, we may infer that isochronism is the 'limit' to which rhythm tends, i.e. the principle of rhythm. But our own rhythm, by which we measure the intervals of objective rhythm, automatically adapts itself to their variations, which we therefore fail to perceive directly as such, though the spontaneous effort of adjustment is felt in proportion to their extent—hence those different qualities of rhythm—till a maximum is reached where adaptation becomes impossible, or at least too great a strain, and the objective rhythm accordingly for us ceases to exist. Within what limits—certainly wider ones—would all this happen when we hear the actual bars? I do not know². I therefore thought it best to compare poetical with

¹ The duration of each complete bar is indicated in centiseconds under its beginning. I beg the reader to remember that I measure the bars from beat to beat (*italics*).

² I am sorry I have not been able to procure Mr Wallin's *Researches on the Rhythm of Speech* (Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory, ix, 1911). As I do not know the conditions of the experiments, though I suppose they also were somewhat artificial, I cannot avail myself of the results, which he briefly sums up in the article first mentioned

musical bars, which latter are acknowledged to be isochronous, and—as Mr Rudmose-Brown quotes with a sneer (“possibly”)—I observed that our four lines are on an average “tout aussi près de l’isochronisme que les plus régulières de mes chansons” (p. 239). Is this going too far?

Mr Rudmose-Brown skips over the lines in which the bars come nearest to absolute isochronism. He continually gibes at Mr La. and Mr Le., whose competence or incompetence he can only guess at, but never even mentions Mme Duclaux (Mary Robinson), whom he can hardly charge with not caring for verse or not knowing how to read her own. However, let that be. We will only consider the examples he alludes to. Most of them were read by Mr La., who assuredly “est philologue et s’occupe plus de grammaire que de poésie” (III, p. 214), but none the less *does* enjoy poetry. As an instance of ‘iambic’ verse, with real rising rhythm, I had chosen

And pass his *days* in peace among his own.

In order to get a complete sentence, I replaced ‘and pass’ by ‘he passed.’ As ‘his own’ could not be easily measured on the tracing, Mr La. suggested ‘his sheep’ instead, “non sans rire, et il récita sans grand enthousiasme, comme il me le dit sur le coup, ce vers que le poète eût pris pour une parodie irrévérencieuse” (III, p. 259):

He passed his *days* in peace among his sheep.—
 59 58 43 45

The rendering I have—perhaps wrongly—assumed to be rather bad. So too, very likely, was Mr Le.’s rendering of

Enoch was host one *day*, Philip the next.—
 85 85 60 67

Nevertheless the bars in each hemistich, or rather section, of the two lines are as equal as can be expected: 59 and 58, 43 and 45; 85 and 85, 60 and 67. That the tempo often changes after a pause, in song as in verse, is a well-known fact¹. Has Mr Rudmose-Brown never met, in the middle of a piece of music, with such words as ‘accelerando’ (i.e. gradually increasing the speed of the movement) or ‘affrettando’ (i.e. hastening the time)? Here we have an ‘affrettando.’ Does it, as is often the case, break rhythmic continuity? Or does it not? In other words, is there still (unconsciously) in the reader’s mind and for the listener’s ear some tendency to an approximate equality of the four bars? The relative variation is not so great as to forbid our thinking so: 14·1 (La.) and 14·4 (Le.). I can also infer it from a notation which I chiefly use in order to “comparer directement la régularité des vers à celle du chant” (III, p. 109). As the bars in different lines or musical phrases are of different lengths, they cannot be compared directly, with

(p. 100). See Verrier, *L’Isochronisme en Musique et en Poésie* (*Journal de Psychologie*, 1912, ii).

¹ See e.g. *L’isochronisme dans le vers français*, ex. VIII and 34.

respect to isochronism, unless they are expressed in function of their unit, or mean. Which gives in the case of our two lines:

La.	1·15	1·14	0·85	0·88,
Le.	1·15	1·15	0·81	0·90.

With regard to the first one, as these figures can reasonably be reduced in round numbers to 1 for each bar, I observed that "cet isochronisme n'est pas aussi loin d'être atteint qu'on se l'imagine en lisant les nombres du tableau ci-dessus" (III, p. 261), i.e. 59, 58, 43, 45 cs. Is this, again, going too far? Mr Rudmose-Brown concludes: "I must protest that the series 59, 58, 43, 45 cs...cannot, by any conceivable process consistent with scientific accuracy[,] be reduced...to 1, 1, 1, 1. The same applies to the line

He sent abroad a shrill and terrible cry,

which, read by Mr La., gave 53, 60, 51, 59 cs., reduced unblushingly by M. Verrier to 1, 1, 1, 1" (p. 240). Here, again, I did nothing of the kind. But the bars, in function of their unit, or mean, are represented by 0·95, 1·07, 0·91, 1·05, which, in round numbers, undoubtedly gives 1, 1, 1, 1. And with regard to their impression on the hearer, they *are* isochronous (*r. v.* = 6·7). Still more so are the double bars, or dipodies: 113 and 110 cs. (*r. v.* = 1·4).

The same applies to this other line, about which Mr Rudmose-Brown also quarrels with me:

Dark as a funeral scarf from stem to stern.—				
La.	67	65	74	64 (III, p. 261).
			<i>r. v.</i> = 4·8.	
	<i>r. v.</i> of the double bars (132 and 138 cs.) = 2·2.			
Le.	80	77	77	70 (III, p. 264).
			<i>r. v.</i> = 3·9.	

Judging by Mr Wallin's differential time-limen (5·2), it must be admitted that the bars (and double bars) would have been perceived, by any listener and under any conditions, as perfectly equal. Even the most regular music seldom comes nearer, or indeed as near, to absolute isochronism. But I am afraid Mr Rudmose-Brown will still "fail to see how isochronism can be inferred" (p. 240).

On p. 232 he says: "M. Verrier...would have spent his space more profitably in clarifying the expression of his own ideas than in abusing his predecessors in metric research. E.g. a long list of metrists including Mr Omond, Mr Thomson and Professor Lewis are (p. 145, note) deficient in "une connaissance suffisante du rythme en général, de la phonétique, de la physiopsychologie et [a misprint, read 'ou'] de l'histoire de la versification anglaise." In this very passage I quoted these English metrists as witnesses to the isochronism I myself advocated. How could I have been so foolish as to disparage the authority of men to whose evidence I appealed. That they, however, have left something for others to do I must assume, or else I should not have taken the trouble to write three big volumes. Why they have done so, I tried to explain by presuming that "il a manqué à tous ces auteurs,

pour appliquer exactement le principe de l'isochronisme [here in italics], une connaissance suffisante de" etc., i.e. of some science or other which at first sight may seem so remote from modern English metric that many metrists treat it as an almost superfluous "preliminary" or even pride themselves on ignoring it, e.g. phonetics. Is this abuse? Mr Rudmose-Brown is particularly unlucky in picking out Mr Omond, whose books I praised as "remarquables," "[du] plus grand intérêt" and "si instructifs" (I, p. 144), Mr William Thomson and Professor Lewis, of whom I said that "[ils] se rapprochent pourtant de la vérité sur presque tous les points importants" (I, p. 145, note 1)—and that too in the very passage he quotes as an instance of my abuse.

One last curious mistake I must mention. I have a record of the well-known line:

A wet sheet and a flowing sea.

As to force, or intensity, all I can gather from the tracing is that 'wet' is at least as strong as 'sheet,' 'sheet' a good deal stronger than 'and,' 'and' at least as strong as 'a,' etc. This accentuation agrees with either of the two possible rhythms:

A. A wet sheet and a flowing sea,—

B. A wet sheet and a flowing sea.—

So far I was quite at a loss to decide which was (consciously or unconsciously) adopted. But the principle of isochronism allowed me to solve the difficulty. Suppose that in a piece of music, through a misprint, there seems to be in *two* places some trace of the 'bar'—i.e. the perpendicular line—which should precede the second beat and indicate the beginning of the second measure: in order to discover which of the two is the right one, you only have to add up the values of the notes before and after each of them, so as to see in which case you get two regular measures. In the same way I was enabled to find out the actual rhythm by trying whether each of the groups '(w)et sheet' and 'and a fl(owing)' or '(w)et sh(eet)' and '(sh)heet and a fl(owing)' occupies the time of a bar. I therefore added up the durations of the rhythmic syllables¹, first according to *A* and then according to *B*, in order to ascertain which scansion gives isochronous bars—at least, the more isochronous bars—i.e. which fits my subject's rendering of the line (III, pp. 243—249). Both operations, of course, with the numbers calculated from the same record. "The same record!" Mr Rudmose-Brown exclaims. "A fresh reading and a fresh record were surely necessary. Nothing whatever is proved except M. Verrier's want of scientific method and common sense" (p. 240). Mr Rudmose-Brown is very kind. As he does not understand my way of proceeding, I will illustrate it by a familiar comparison. I hope I shall not offend him by

¹ By 'rhythmic syllable' I mean the interval between two "syllabic onsets" (Wm Thomson, *Rhythm and Scansion*, pp. 3 and 4), i.e. from the beginning of a syllabic sound (generally a vowel) to the beginning of the next one. See Verrier, *La Mesure des durées rythmiques* (*Revue de Phonétique*, 1912).

suggesting that he sometimes buys a hat. When he sees the hatter bring him a couple, in order to try them on, I wonder whether he exclaims in the same genial tone: "Two hats! And of a different size! Do you think I have got two heads? I admire your want of common sense." The hatter might reply: "Two heads? I'm afraid you have not got one." This, of course, would also be extremely rude. But what could Mr Rudmose-Brown retort? I cannot guess. In any case the hatter would very likely decline to discuss any further.

So do I.

PAUL VERRIER.

PARIS.

REVIEWS.

L'exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVI^e siècle.

By GILBERT CHINARD. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1911. 8vo.
xvii + 246 pp.

M. Chinard, who is Maître de Conférences at Brown University, Providence, has chosen an interesting as well as an appropriate subject, and has treated it in an interesting fashion. That subject is the influence of the discovery and conquest of America on French Literature in the sixteenth century. Of his ten chapters five (I, II, IV, VI, VII) deal with the discoveries themselves and the narratives relating to them, while the remaining five are concerned with the influence of these discoveries on ideas and literature. The chief writers who come under M. Chinard's survey are Rabelais (c. III), Ronsard (c. V) and Montaigne (c. IX). Rabelais's sources are never very easy to detect, they are so various, so haphazard, so unexpected. You may be hot on a literary trail, when you are suddenly checked by what another investigator convincingly shews to be a personal reminiscence. You come upon what evidently seems a personal touch, and it turns out to be a translation from some contemporary Latin writer. It may be said, however, as a general rule that when Rabelais borrows he does it unblushingly, and without any attempt to cover up his tracks. For that reason it seems to me that M. Chinard's quest into Rabelais's geographical sources has not led to results which are sufficiently precise to be convincing. He would doubtless have modified his chapter if he had known that one source at any rate is certain, viz. the *Novus Orbis* of Simon Grynaeus. This volume contains among many other pieces a Latin version (at fifth hand) of the Travels of Marco Polo and a summary of Peter Martyr's Fourth Decade, both of which writers M. Chinard believes to have been used by Rabelais¹. I am glad to see that he contemplates a special study of the influence of Marco Polo, which he thinks is considerable. I cannot say that I have found much trace of him. I had thought indeed that Rabelais's unicorn (v, 29) owed something to his rhinoceros, until Mr W. F. Smith pointed out to me that it comes straight out of Pliny.

As regards the influence of Jacques Cartier's narrative we seem to be pretty much in agreement, though personally, since M. Lefranc's

¹ *Modern Language Review*, II, 316 ff.

discovery of the real Jamet Brayer I have become sceptical as to the identification of Rabelais's pilot with the Breton seaman. A still graver doubt would seem to rest on the identification of Xenomanes with Jean-Alfonse of Saintonge, first proposed by Pierre Margry, for M. Sainéan has recently shewn that his *Cosmographie*, which the *Hydrographie* deposited by Xenomanes with Gargantua was supposed to represent, is nothing but a defective translation of the *Suma de geografia* of Fernandez de Enciso (Seville, 1519)¹. It does not, however, follow that Jean-Alfonse, because he was an ignorant and dishonest writer, was not a capable navigator. In fact what we know about him shews that he was. He may still therefore be meant by Xenomanes, and he may still have written or left notes for an *Hydrographie* of which Rabelais had heard, but which is now lost. But it is also possible, and it would be quite in accordance with Rabelais's fantastic humour, that Xenomanes represents somebody who was not a pilot at all.

In the last words of his chapter on Rabelais M. Chinard couples Mandeville and Marco Polo as adventurous and imaginative travellers. This is unjust to Marco Polo, whose narrative is generally regarded as a tolerably faithful record of what he saw, though, in accordance with a common practice of travellers which was still honoured in the sixteenth century, he inserted information which he had got from hearsay or *ouy dire*. That surely is the point of Rabelais's satire in the chapter on the Country of Satin which has disconcerted M. Chinard. Why, he asks, does Rabelais, who had such confidence in Cartier that he made him Pantagrue's pilot, put him among writers who wrote *par ouy dire*? There are only two ways, he says, out of the difficulty. Either Jamet Brayer is not Jacques Cartier or the chapter is not by Rabelais. I thoroughly agree with him in rejecting the latter alternative, but though I contemplate the first alternative without a pang, there is yet a third alternative, namely, that Rabelais while believing in Cartier's skill as a navigator and in his general trustworthiness as a narrator, ventured to doubt whether all his information was the result of first-hand observation.

If M. Chinard then has not definitely added to our knowledge of Rabelais's geographical sources, he has at any rate written an interesting and suggestive chapter, and he has done well in laying emphasis on Rabelais's attitude to mediæval traditions. It is just because of the mixture in Rabelais of the mediæval spirit with that of the Renaissance that he is so complete a representative of his age.

On the other hand as regards Montaigne, M. Chinard has made a real addition to his known sources. He shews that passages in his essay *On Cannibals* (I, xxx) are borrowed, sometimes without the alteration of a word, from a translation of Girolamo Benzoni's *Historia del Mondo nuovo* (Venice, 1565), made by Urbain Chauveton, a zealous Protestant. Benzoni, a Milanese, who had spent fourteen years in America, judged the conduct of the Spaniards with great severity, and

¹ *Rev. des études rabelaisiennes*, x (1912), 19 ff.

Chauveton supplemented his translation with a *Brief discours* of his own on the massacre of the French Protestants in Florida. M. Chinard analyses this pamphlet at some length in his seventh chapter, and praises it highly for its literary qualities. As its date is 1579, it follows that the opening part of Montaigne's essay *On Cannibals* was written in that year as the earliest, and therefore not long before the publication of his *Essays* in 1580. Another possible source, according to M. Chinard, for this essay is Jean Léry, a gentleman of Burgundy, who published in 1578 an account of Villegagnon's expedition to Brazil.

The other essay of Montaigne's which is largely concerned with the New World is that *On Coaches*, written probably in 1586 or 1587. M. Chinard well points out the difference in tone between the two essays. While the earlier one is inspired by the writer's curiosity and love of humorous paradox, the later one is eloquent with sympathy for the unfortunate inhabitants of Mexico and Peru, and with indignation against their Spanish conquerors. 'We are so accustomed,' says M. Chinard, 'to see in Montaigne the sceptic, that we too often forget that he was a man, and that he sometimes steeped his lips in the milk of human kindness.' I read this remark with pleasure, for it shews that M. Chinard's eyes have been opened to the error of the view that Montaigne is a pure sceptic, and that he could not be eloquent on behalf of virtue and things of good repute. Interesting, too, is the suggestion that between the first publication of the *Essays*, and that of 1588, Montaigne had progressed in a moral sense, 'that his conception of the world had been enlarged, and that he had become really better.' This is just the opposite to M. Strowski's view. But here I must reluctantly leave M. Chinard; there are many other interesting things in his book, but space forbids me to notice them.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Herder als Faust. Eine Untersuchung. Von GÜNTHER JACOBY.
Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1911. 8vo. xii + 485 pp.

Günther Jacoby, dem wir eine sehr förderliche, wenn auch etwas breit gehaltene Untersuchung und Bewertung der ästhetischen Lebensarbeit Herders und ihrer Berechtigung gegenüber den Anschauungen Kants verdanken¹, versucht sich hier auf dem Gebiete der Literaturgeschichte. Leider mit wenig Erfolg. Was er in seinen ermüdend breiten, mit Wiederholungen übersättigten und oft in deklamatorischem Stil gehaltenen Ausführungen zu beweisen sucht, ist die Behauptung 'dass Herder Goethes Faust ist, und zwar der Faust des ersten Teiles bis zum Auftritt im Auerbachkeller.' Es sollen also nicht bloss Züge von Herders Charakter, Anschauungen von ihm verwertet sein (womit die Forschung längst rechnete), sondern Herder, der mit Goethe in Strassburg

¹ G. Jacoby, *Herders und Kants Aesthetik*. Im gleichen Verlage, 1907.

verkehrte, soll Faust selber sein; freilich nicht der empirische Herder mit seinen tausend kleinen Schwächen, sondern 'das geheimnisvolle, übermenschliche Bild Herders,' das Goethe von 'seinem Abgott' entworfen hatte. Und wie führt Jacoby seinen Beweis? Nicht, indem er mit der Sonde der modernen Individualpsychologie in die Tiefe der Persönlichkeit Herders hineinfährt und uns zeigt, dass Goethe in Faust einen Charakter von der gleichen seelischen Struktur, von demselben emotionellen Typus, von gleicher Stärke und Richtung des Willenslebens, von gleichem (nicht nur gelegentlich ähnlichem) äusseren und vor allem inneren Entwicklungsgange dargestellt habe—sondern durch eine massenhafte Anhäufung von Parallelen, die er mit grossem Fleisse, aber auch mit einseitiger Beschränkung auf Herders Schriften und ohne eine wirklich umfassende Kenntnis der Literatur des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts zusammengetragen hat! Hätten wir in Faust wirklich einen Menschen von der gleichen Art und Bildung wie Herder vor uns, warum sollte dann die psychologische Identität nicht über die Auerbachszene hinausreichen? Aber nicht einmal bis zur Auerbachszene will Jacoby sie ausdehnen. Hören wir die wunderlichen Programmsätze auf S. 49: 'Wir wenden uns nunmehr zu jenen Gestalten, die in jenen Auftritten des Faust erscheinen. Es sind stets zwei. Auf der einen Seite der von unbefriedigtem Wissensdurst zerrissene, den tatsächlichen Befund der einzelnen Wissenschaften verachtende, zu weltfrischem Leben sich hingedrängt fühlende Gelehrte, der das Tiefste erkennen will und nur erkennt, dass wir nichts wissen. Faust und Mephisto teilen sich in diese Rolle. Auf der andern Seite der harmlose, von der Macht der Wissenschaft überzeugte Jüngling: Famulus Wagner als künftiger Stubengelehrter und der junge Schüler; hier und da endlich Faust selbst Mephisto gegenüber. Immer diese beiden Gestalten. Es wäre zu weit gegriffen, wenn wir behaupten wollten: der unbefriedigte, spottende und verachtende Gelehrte sei schlechthin Herder. Es wäre falsch, Goethe und den wissenschaftsgläubigen Jüngling für ein und dasselbe zu halten. Weder deckt sich Herder schlechthin mit Faust und Mephisto, noch deckt sich Goethe auch nur annähernd mit Wagner und dem Schüler' usw. Damit ist für den psychologisch geschulten Leser das Buch bereits gerichtet. Eine Persönlichkeit ist ein geschlossener Organismus und lässt sich in dieser Weise nicht auf verschiedene dramatische Charaktere verteilen, ohne dass die Einheit darüber zugrunde ginge. Dass ein dramatischer Charakter Züge von einer lebenden Persönlichkeit hat und dass Faust solche Züge mit Herder teilt, wussten wir immer. Dass aber Faust Herder sei, davon kann keine Rede sein.

So beschränkt sich der Ertrag des umfangreichen Buches auf die beigebrachten Parallelen zwischen Herders Schriften und Goethes Text. Leider fehlt dem Verfasser auch hier die philologische Schulung; er weiss wohl, dass einige Szenen des Faust früher gedichtet sind, als andere, aber von einer bewussten, methodischen, durchgehenden Scheidung der alten und neuen Schichten, von einer vorsichtigen Datierung herangezogener Gedichte Herders ist kaum die Spur zu

finden¹. So werden diese Parallelen im einzelnen immer wieder einer sorgfältigen Nachprüfung bedürfen, wie wir sie hier nicht anstellen können. Hinderlich für die Benutzung des Buches ist der Umstand, dass Jacoby die wichtigste Faustliteratur wohl in der Einleitung nennt, im einzelnen aber nicht zitiert und der Leser somit nicht ohne weiteres überblickt, wie viel ihm z. B. die ausserordentlich förderliche Studie Collins über den 'Urfaust' vorgearbeitet hatte. Andererseits aber sind ihm so unentbehrliche Vorarbeiten wie Bouckes treffliches Buch² unbekannt; sonst hätte er Herders dynamistische Lehre von der Kontrarietät in einen viel weiteren Zusammenhang rücken und damit für die Erklärung auch des Faust ganz anders fruchtbar machen können. Immerhin steckt in den vergleichenden Abschnitten Jacobys reiches und wertvolles Material, das, mit der nötigen Kritik benutzt, die Forschung befruchten kann. Die historische Interpretation freilich erfährt wenig Förderung. Mich wenigstens kann Jacobys Hypothese nicht überzeugen, dass Herder genauere Kenntnis von Lessings Faustplänen mit nach Strassburg gebracht habe und dadurch Goethe zu seiner Dichtung angeregt worden sei, in der dann Lessing eine Art unerlaubter Konkurrenz gesehen hätte. Und für den grossen Läuterungsprozess, der sich in der dramatischen Handlung des zweiten Teils aus dem steten Ineinanderwirken der zwei Seelen in Faust ergibt, hat Jacoby kein Verständnis. 'Statt Gefühl und Sinnlichkeit in gegenseitiger Einschränkung wirken zu lassen, stürzt Faust von einer Vereinzelung seiner Seelenkräfte zu der anderen. Er stürzt von Sünde zu Sünde.' (Und das soll dann das Ebenbild Herders sein!) 'Das Ende des zweiten Teils in Goethes Faust bringt, unvermutet und abgebrochen, fast möchte man sagen: unbegründet, die im himmlischen Vorspiel verheissene Lösung.' Sapiienti sat!

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

The Lay of the Nibelung Men. Translated from the Old German text by ARTHUR S. WAY. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. Large 8vo. xxi + 325 pp.

Mr Way's translation is the ninth attempt that has been made to reproduce the *Nibelungenlied* in English. It may be said at once that from the artistic point of view he has surpassed all his predecessors. There are, it is true, metrically unsatisfactory lines which have to be read more than once before the position of the caesura and the incidence of the stress become clear; the rime, though generally good, is sometimes treated rather freely (*he: triumphantly; blood: good; lord: word;*

¹ Den philologischen Leser wird es belustigen, zu hören, dass der 'erhabene Geist' in der Szene 'Wald und Höhle' und der Geist, den Faust in der Szene 'Trüber Tag, Feld' anredet, ein anderer als der Erdgeist ist und zwar der 'Makrokosmos,' der Weltgeist im Grossen, dessen Zeichen Faust in der ersten Szene erblickt.

² E. A. Boucke, *Goethes Weltanschauung auf historischer Grundlage*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der dynamischen Denkrichtung und Gegensatzlehre. Stuttgart, Frommann, 1907.

misery: lie; etc.); and the translator's fondness for forceful language occasionally produces expressions that are hardly happy ('the feastful board,' p. 2; 'Siegfried's limbs at the death-stab leapt convulsively,' p. 133; 'No battle-blencher was Etzel,' p. 276). But in spite of these occasional blemishes it must be granted that Mr Way has caught something of the spirit of William Morris, whose *Story of Sigurd the Völsung and the Fall of the Niblungs* has served as his model so far as the metrical form—and apparently also the style—is concerned. And as none of the previous translations, unfortunately, can honestly be described as maintaining a really high poetic level, we have here a distinct advance, for which Mr Way deserves our congratulations and thanks.

Regarded merely as a translation, however, Mr Way's work is more open to criticism. His adoption of the epic metre used by William Morris (couplets of six feet in irregular ascending rhythm with feminine caesura and masculine rime) in place of the Nibelungen stanza may be entirely justified, and is, as a matter of fact, no great departure from the metre of the original; but of the style of the *Nibelungenlied* there is in this translation hardly a trace. One of the most striking characteristics of the medieval German epic is its simplicity of both thought and expression, its naturalness, its lack of embellishment. One of the most striking characteristics of Mr Way's translation is its wealth of metaphors, of superlatives, of sonorous phrases, of bold compounds and combinations. '*Von küener recken striten*' becomes: 'Of the thunder of war-waves clashing'; '*daz in allen landen niht schæners mohte sîn*'—'Though ye searched, ye should find none fairer to the uttermost ends of the earth'; '*Kriemhilt geheizen; si wart ein scæne wip*'—'And her name far-sung was Kriemhild, she was sweeter than speech may tell'; '*Der minnedlichen meide triuten wol gezam. ir muotten küene recken, niemen was ir gram*'—'There was no man whose pride had warded his breast against love's dart | Shot from the eyes victorious, from the snare of many a heart'; all from the first three stanzas—and so on almost indefinitely. Mr Way's translation is, in fact, consistently, on page after page, more emphatic and more consciously beautiful and poetic than his original. But for that very reason he fails to reproduce the original, and an English reader cannot but receive a very misleading impression of the style and even the spirit of the German poem. The *Nibelungenlied* is, in Schiller's language, 'naïv'; Mr Way's muse is 'sentimentalisch.' The *Nibelungenlied* is typical medieval 'Volkspoesie'; Mr Way's translation reminds one rather of that type of modern 'Kunstpoesie' which corresponds to the pre-Raphaelite school of painting.

In view of Mr Way's repute as a classical scholar and translator of Greek epic and dramatic literature we naturally expect his translation of the *Nibelungenlied* to be above the average in scholarly accuracy. So far as can be judged by a comparison of various portions of his often rather free rendering with the M.H.G. text this is actually the case. He has avoided most of the numerous mistranslations that mar the

work of nearly all his predecessors—Professor G. H. Needler's is the one thoroughly scholarly translation yet published—though he has not escaped *all* the pitfalls that beset the unwary translator from medieval German. To mention a few examples: '*drie künige edel unde rîch*'—'Three highborn Kings and *wealthy*' (p. 7); '*milde*'—'of *courtesy* the crown' (p. 1), '*Lady of Courtesy*' (p. 57), but correctly 'open-handed' (p. 70); '*wie liebe mit leide ze ungest lônem kan*'—'How love hath sorrow for guerdon, etc.' (p. 3); '*sô sêre zurnde der wunde, des gie im werlîchen nôt*'—'*Maddened him now that death-wound, a very torment of pain*' (p. 133). The first three are typical of nearly all translations from medieval German, most translators falling into the mistake of giving the modern meaning to these and other words whose meaning has changed considerably—an important matter in some cases, such as *liep*, *liebe*, and *lieben*. In the last example Mr Way has either overlooked the gender of *wunde* and misunderstood the idiomatic use of *gie im nôt*, or deliberately substituted his own thought. His original quite characteristically hardly so much as hints at physical pain throughout the whole description of Siegfried's death.

In conclusion, lest blame should appear to outweigh well-deserved praise, Mr Way's translation of the rather difficult lines in which Etzel describes with grim humour the warrior-minstrel Volker may be *quoted:

Within there fighteth a warrior, Volker, a name of dread.
Like some wild boar he rageth—and a minstrel him they name!
Thank Heaven that safe from the talons of this foul fiend I came!
Doom rings and sings in his measures, red are the strokes of his bow;
In his notes I hear the death-knell of many a knight laid low.
What hath the viol-minstrel against us know I not.
Never by guest such sorrow upon mine house was brought!

Here, and in many other passages like it, we have something like the real *Nibelungenlied*.

F. E. SANDBACH.

BIRMINGHAM.

Historical Manual of English Prosody. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY.
London: Macmillan. 1910. 8vo. xvii + 347 pp.

It may at once be said that Professor Saintsbury's *Manual* is the most useful book of the kind that we have. It has the great merit of being readable as well as instructive; and though we may find some incompleteness and regret some perversities of expression, the exposition and illustration of principles is sufficiently sound so far as it goes, and the historical survey of English poets and English prosodists contains an immense amount of useful information in a comparatively small space.

After some preliminary skirmishing with supposed opponents, which in such a book as this might perhaps have been spared, we arrive at a full statement of the author's system of scansion, on the 'foot' system,

with a long and interesting chapter of illustrations, in which the selection of passages is for the most part admirable. This constitutes the First Book. Then comes as Book II a historical account of the development of English verse from the origins to the present time, and this is followed by an outline of the history of prosodical theory. Book IV consists of 'auxiliary apparatus,' a very full explanatory glossary of terms, a list of English poets in alphabetical order, with short appreciations of their prosodic quality and influence, a brief chapter on the origins of the most important forms of line and stanza, and finally a useful bibliography.

We have here a far more systematic treatment of the subject than in the author's *History of English Prosody*, which suffered much for want of clear statement of principles and definition of terms. The confusion between length and stress, which is so disturbing a feature in the larger book, is evidently less misleading when we are clearly told that the 'length' of a syllable does not really mean its length in the ordinary sense of the word, that is the time which it takes to pronounce, but something quite different. At the same time it is to be regretted that Professor Saintsbury should use the terms 'long' and 'short' in the way he does, partly because such use is seriously misleading, in spite of explanation, and more because the terms are wanted for other purposes. Presumably Professor Saintsbury's object in using these particular terms in this manner is to justify the application of classical names to English feet. Such application is no doubt convenient, but it has in any case to be remembered that it is made by virtue not of identity but of analogy, and the analogy holds good whether the syllables are called 'long' and 'short' or stressed and unstressed. Probably 'strong' and 'weak' would meet the case as well as any other nomenclature, it being understood of course that a foot may on occasion consist of two strong syllables (the spondee) or of two weak syllables (the pyrrhic). The mischief of Professor Saintsbury's terminology is that it tends to put out of sight the part which is played in English verse by actual length of syllable, either in combination with stress, in which case it is one of the elements of strength, or apart from it, giving many subtle variations of rhythm which apparently quite escape Professor Saintsbury's attention.

We must also note that though a full account is given of the various feet which are admissible in English verse, little or nothing is said in the 'rules' about the way in which they are combined. Surely in a manual of prosody we ought to be told something about the extent to which trochaic substitution, for example, can be used in iambic verse, and the conditions of its use; and again something might with advantage have been said about the use of the pyrrhic, the foot which has no element of length or stress, but obtains its metrical value from the reader's conscious or unconscious acceptance of the normal rhythm, and is either compensated by a neighbouring spondee, as in

Left him at large to *his* own dark designs,

or serves to concentrate emphasis on one or more of the other elements of the line, as in

Rapt in the fear *and* in the wonder of it.

Professor Saintsbury's suggestion that such a combination obtains its value as a foot because one of its syllables, though not long, is capable of being lengthened, is really unworthy of him. No good reader of verse would ever dwell on such a foot, and if he did so he would ruin the intended effect. We suspect that in this matter of the pyrrhic foot lies the key to much that has puzzled English prosodists.

A few criticisms of detail suggest themselves. (1) To illustrate the verse of the Old English period Professor Saintsbury quotes nine lines only (p. 37), and these contain altogether no less than five serious misprints. (2) The theory that Chaucer mingled alexandrines with his five measure verse is much too hastily thrown out. It is certain that such a line as

And kepeth in semblant alle his observaunces

cannot possibly be an alexandrine. (3) It is a pity that Professor Saintsbury should be content to accept the usual indiscriminate condemnation of the verse of *Gorboduc*. It ought rather to have been his delight to shew what admirable examples of blank verse are afforded by the Sackville portions of that interesting tragedy, instead of culling a commonplace instance of rudimentary stiffness from Norton (p. 63). Surely it is worth while to note that such blank verse as the following was produced on the English stage as early as 1561:

We then, alas, the ladies which that time
Did there attend, seeing that heinous deed,
And hearing him oft call the wretched name
Of mother, and to cry to her for aid,
Whose direful hand gave him the mortal wound,
Pitying, alas, (for nought else could we do)
His ruthful end, ran to the woeful bed,
Despoiled straight his breast, and all we might,
Wiped in vain with napkins next at hand
The sudden streams of blood that flushed fast
Out of the gaping wound. O what a look,
O what a ruthful steadfast eye methought
He fix'd upon my face, which to my death
Will never part from me, when with a braid
A deep-fetch'd sigh he gave, and therewithal
Clasping his hands to heaven he cast his sight.

This is not an example of 'extreme stiffness and "single-mouldedness" in the lines.' On the contrary, in freedom it compares favourably with most of Marlowe's verse, and yet it was written at least six and twenty years earlier than *Tamburlaine*.

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557.
By E. GORDON DUFF. (The Sandars Lectures, 1911.) Cambridge:
University Press. 1912. 8vo. x + 153 pp.

In these Lectures Mr Duff supplements those which he delivered in 1899 and 1904, dealing with the printers, stationers and bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535. The terminal date chosen for the present series is fixed by the year in which the charter was granted to the re-formed Company of Stationers, containing a clause which virtually put an end to provincial printing. With the exception of a few books, Mr Duff says, printed under a special privilege at Norwich between 1566 and 1579, and a doubtful York book of 1579, no book was printed outside London until 1584-5, when the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford once more started their presses. Within the period chosen, printing was exercised in ten towns, and the presses fall roughly into three groups. The first contains Oxford, St Alban's, and York, the second Oxford's revived press, Cambridge, Tavistock, Abingdon, and the second St Alban's press, and the last group Ipswich, Worcester, and Canterbury. Besides these there are the books printed for Hereford and Exeter, and the books with false or misleading imprints, such as Winchester and Greenwich.

The number of books with which Mr Duff treats in these lectures is surprisingly small. Only one hundred and thirty-two books are at present known to have been issued by the English Provincial presses between 1478 and 1556, and it is doubtful if many more remain to be discovered. The difficulties moreover connected with the subject are considerable, for to the books not known from actual inspection must be added the books which have disappeared, books, as Ames would have said, which are asleep. Very slowly, in spite of the remarkable growth in the study of the subject which the last quarter of a century has witnessed, does fresh information come to light. Mr Duff announces one new St Alban's book. He records Mr A. G. Murray's important discovery in connexion with the Ipswich edition of Bale's *Scriptores*, and he notes all work done upon the subject, thus duly recording Mr F. E. M. Beck's paper on the *Plaister for a galled horse*. The bibliography at the end of the book is important and exhaustive. Not the least charm of these lectures lies in the delightful modesty with which Mr Duff relates, or rather conceals, his own discoveries. From the words themselves the fortunate hunter could not be identified. The humour of the writer deserves a passing tribute.

A very valuable Appendix gives a list of all the books from these provincial presses, known or recorded, with a statement as to the present locality of all copies known. The index is not quite perfect. Mr Duff's final paragraph deserves attention:

Perhaps what may have struck you most is how much we have yet to learn on the subject, how little we really know. A good deal of what has been said has been, not about books which we possess, but about books which we have lost. A cloud

of obscurity still hangs over the subject, but the cloud has a silver lining. Think how much there still remains for us to discover.

Any further discoveries can only be made on the lines which Mr Duff has here laid down; and to anyone willing to investigate further this book, small as it is, is indispensable.

CHARLES SAYLE.

CAMBRIDGE.

English Nativity Plays. Edited by SAMUEL B. HEMINGWAY. (Yale Studies in English xxxviii.) New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1909. 8vo. xlviii + 319 pp.

This is a doctoral thesis of a useful type, in which Yale has specialized under the fostering care of Prof. A. S. Cook. Instead of writing 'about it and about,' the ripening student is set down to do a steady bit of textual editing, with introduction and commentary complete. Mr Hemingway's contribution consists of a comparative study of a section of the English miracle-play cycle, covering the episodes known as the Annunciation, the Salutation of Elizabeth, the Suspicion of Joseph (but not, for what seems an inadequate reason, the Purgation of Mary), Augustus and Cyrenius, the Nativity, the Conversion of Octavian, and the *Pastores*. The texts brought together are those of the Chester, *Ludus Coventriae*, York and Townley cycles; the Coventry play proper is not included. The Chester text is taken from the Devonshire manuscript, which Mr Hemingway is probably right in thinking the best representative of its group, and on the whole a better version than Harleian MS. 2124, upon which the E.E.T.S. edition is based. For all the plays a careful collation, not only of manuscripts, but also of all important emendations suggested by modern scholars, who have been particularly busy with the York plays, is appended in the form of foot-notes. Mr Hemingway's terminal notes are comprehensive and concern themselves largely with the indication of sources. His introduction gives a good summary of the problems, mostly unsolved, which surround the genesis of the English cycles. He supports the suggested attribution of the Chester plays to Randall Higden by pointing out that two sources used by Higden in the *Polychronicon* are also used in the sixth of the Chester plays. These are the *Supputaciones* of Martinus Polonus, from which both writers took the Octavian-Sibyl myth, and the *De Naturis Rerum* of Alexander Neckam, from which both apparently took the Vergilian account of the Temple of Peace. This is a line of investigation which, as Mr Hemingway himself suggests, might with advantage be applied to the rest of the cycle.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

GERRARD'S CROSS,

Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602. Edited by W. W. GREG.
(Tudor and Stuart Library.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910.
8vo. lvi + 100 pp.

Like other recent work by Mr Greg, this is an essay in the higher bibliography. The main object of the editor is to study the puzzling interrelations of the 1602 Quarto and the 1623 Folio versions of *The Merry Wives*, with a view to determining the probable conditions under which each text may be supposed to have come into existence, and the extent to which, in each text, the original intention of Shakespeare has been obscured or modified by the working of other agencies. The task is well adapted to his remarkable powers of critical analysis, and his results, expounded in a luminous introduction, and supported by voluminous notes, are always suggestive and sometimes convincing. One would like to see the method applied to all the plays which, like *The Merry Wives*, have reached us in allotropic states; although it must perhaps be said that, elegant as is the *format* of the *Tudor and Stuart Library*, the discussions involved rather markedly call for the accompaniment of a parallel-text edition. Mr Greg defines his own object as an attempt to establish 'what I imagine to be the first quasi-quantitative analysis of the respective responsibility of these three hypothetical persons—reporter, adapter, and reviser—for the divergencies of the extant texts.' The reporter is the person who supplied to the printer, from a garbled memory of what he had heard upon the stage, the 'copy' for the piratical Quarto text. The adapter is the person who shortened and in other ways adapted the author's original manuscript for the purposes of stage representation; and Mr Greg supposes his operations to antedate both texts, and the effect of them to have been comparatively slight. From the adapter he distinguishes the reviser, whom he supposes to have been employed to make deliberate changes, on grounds other than the needs of the actors, in the structure of the play. And in fact he postulates two revisions; one by a hand other than the author's, also antedating both texts, and designed to eliminate the audacious horse-stealing episode, of which a few traces none the less escaped; the other very trifling, carried out by Shakespeare himself, and apparent in the Folio text only. The most interesting section of Mr Greg's analysis is that in which he attempts to identify the personality of the reporter. This rogue he takes to have been none other than the actor who played the part of the Host of the Garter, and he bases his conjecture on a demonstration of the greater accuracy in the Quarto of all those scenes during which the Host was on the stage. This is extremely ingenious. My only hesitation in subscribing to the theory is that one would have expected the actor to have had an actual manuscript in his possession of his own part, with its cues, and therefore to have been able to ensure absolute instead of merely relative accuracy for his own speeches. Mr Greg suggests that he may have 'learned his part imperfectly and

very likely by ear.' But we know that written 'parts' were used by Elizabethan companies, and we do not know, although it may have been the case, that they employed actors who could not read.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

GERRARD'S CROSS.

William Rowley, his 'All's Lost by Lust,' and 'A Shoemaker a Gentleman.' With an Introduction on Rowley's Place in the Drama. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.) By CHARLES WHARTON STORK. 1910. 8vo. 288 pp.

From an educational point of view, it is an excellent plan to edit one or two of an author's best works, accompanying the selection with a general study of his whole output or of the type of literature to which it belongs. To the editor it affords a very varied training, and if well done, the result is a testimony to his all-round ability; and it is presumably for this reason that of late so many of the publications of American Universities in the field of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature have been of this kind. From the point of view of scholarship, however, the plan has much less to recommend it; for not only do such books stand in the way of more exhaustive studies of their subjects and of complete editions of the authors represented, but in themselves, whether because the attainments requisite for good literary history and for scientific editing are by no means always united in the same person, or simply by reason of the editor's divided interests, they are seldom wholly satisfactory. It cannot be said that the present volume is entirely free from the faults of its class.

By far the greater part of Mr Stork's sixty-page Introduction is devoted to a discussion of Rowley's share in nineteen plays of which he is supposed to have been part author, based on the four plays on the title-page of which his name appears alone. This is a careful piece of work and well deserves attention, but it may, I think, be questioned whether investigations of this sort, in which from so little certain work so much is inferred that must be doubtful, are worth while; or rather perhaps whether it is worth while to try to explain in detail how the results are arrived at. Evidence derived from the technique of verse has a certain definiteness which makes it always of value, and when we have a sufficient mass of an author's writings upon which to base our investigations, we may be helped by peculiarities of vocabulary or by unconscious tricks of style; but the broader characteristics of a man's work, though they may become apparent to one who has made long study of him, can seldom be so analysed or reduced to a formula that arguments based upon them can be appreciated by others. To most readers it will, I think, appear that the editor's attributions of authorship rest ultimately on no more than his personal opinion that such and such a character is too real for Heywood, or would have been invested

by Dekker with more poetic charm, or that such and such a pun is of the kind that Rowley might have made, and the like, and in spite of all his careful analysis, against the quality and thoroughness of which there is nothing to be objected, Rowley will remain a personality of the vaguest.

The most useful part of the volume is undoubtedly the reprint of *All's Lost by Lust* and *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*. The text is, on the whole, very conservative. Mr Stork retains the spelling¹, though not the italics, of the quartos; and indeed the only important departure from exact following of the original is in the treatment of line-division, as to which the editor displays some uncertainty. As is often the case in early editions of plays, much that was evidently intended as prose was printed in irregular lines, with capitals, as if verse. When the editor regards a passage as verse he does not hesitate to re-divide the lines according to scansion, but what he considers as prose he somewhat inconsistently leaves in the original lines, contenting himself with removing the capitals. I cannot but think that if he was unwilling to adopt the modern method of arranging verse and prose, it would have been more satisfactory to print line for line with the original throughout. This would certainly have been the easier method, for, as in the case of Fletcher, whose rhythms Mr Stork thinks that Rowley imitated, it is often very difficult to decide where verse ends and prose begins. On pp. 84—5, for example, there seems little more reason for regarding ll. 120—7 as verse than for so regarding ll. 142—6.

The editor's emendations are occasionally superfluous. For example at p. 101, l. 140 and p. 223, l. 39 it was quite unnecessary to change 'of' into 'off' in a conservative text; the first form is well recognized. Again, p. 171, l. 77, 'these' requires no correction; 'corps' was often regarded as a plural. But the only serious error of this kind seems to be the alteration in p. 121, l. 53, of 'my nowne' to 'mine owne.' Surely Mr Stork must have met with this frequent form elsewhere. Lastly at p. 196, l. 50, it may be suggested that 'Thy' of the original should almost certainly be 'By.'

Such passages of the text as I have compared with the quartos seem to be quite free from error, and the text as a whole has evidently been prepared with great care.

The notes do not err on the side of over-elaboration; indeed in certain respects they are decidedly scanty. We should at any rate, I think, have been shown how in *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*, Rowley made use of his source, Deloney's *Gentle Craft*, and have been told, for example, that the last fourteen lines of Act IV are borrowed almost word for word from that work. It is hardly enough to refer in general terms to Lange's reprint of it.

A few remarks on some of the notes may be added:

p. 81, ll. 5—7. *cold as Aquarius...enter into Pisces*. The meaning

¹ In the preface the editor strangely says: '*v* has been substituted for *u* of the older spelling,' but the original editions of the two plays reprinted conform throughout to the modern usage as regards these letters, and also *j*.

of these lines will be apparent to anyone who remembers that the sun is in Aquarius during the coldest part of the year (Jan.—Feb.), and that the next sign which he enters is Pisces.

p. 99, l. 103. When an editor refers to a certain 'well-known passage' of Ovid, he should not proceed to quote it as 'Omnis amator militat.'

p. 108, l. 37. *I'll give thee seed and reasons.* The editor notes that 'the allusion is obscure.' Surely the author is merely referring to the drug wormseed and to raisins, both of which were used as a cure for intestinal worms (for the raisins see Lupton's *Notable Things*, ii, 61). The person addressed has just complained that he has 'a bed of snakes' within him. For the pun on 'raisins' and 'reasons' compare Middleton's *Old Law*, v, i, 597.

p. 113, l. 10. *widows almes.* Nothing to do with 'mite' and 'might,' as the editor suggests, but the name of certain leg-irons used in Newgate: cf. Nashe's *Strange News*, sig. K 4.

p. 220, l. 46. On the words 'Globe of Earth' spoken by Dioclesian, the editor remarks: 'A bad anachronism, if one should be pedantic.' Why? Does he think that in the time of Dioclesian the earth was not known to be a globe?

p. 233, l. 211. *Wiperginie.* Besides being the name of a game, as the editor says, the word was also used as a cant term for a wench, which is obviously the sense required here.

p. 251, l. 173. *my Currier.* Neither a letter-carrier nor a driver, as Mr Stork conjectures, but a leather-dresser. The shoemakers bought their leather on Mondays, as we learn from *The Gentle Craft*, ed. Lange, p. 96.

Lastly it is to be regretted that references are not given in the Glossary. In this respect, as in some others, a comparatively small amount of additional work on the part of the editor would have very greatly increased the value of his book. But Mr Stork has done much, and perhaps we should not complain that he has not done more. We have to thank him for what is on the whole a very careful and satisfactory edition of two interesting plays.

R. B. MCKERROW.

LONDON.

The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) By SAMUEL LEE WOLFF. New York: The Columbia University Press. 1912. 8vo. x + 529 pp.

This is a scholarly, judicious and laborious work, and its conclusions—unlike those of many works of similar character—generally carry conviction. The author has wisely restricted himself to a consideration of the influence of three Greek romances,—Heliodorus' *Æthiopica*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*—on five English writers of fiction—Lyly, Sidney, Greene, Nashe and

Lodge, only prefacing this investigation by an illuminating analysis of the general and special characteristics of the Greek romances. He shows very clearly how many of those elements of Elizabethan literature which we are apt to look upon as especially anti-classical are already to be found in that late Greek literature which emanated originally from Alexandria. 'It is as if the Greek Romances were "made to order" for the entertainment of the Renaissance. Their authors, like Virgil, "divined what the future would love." Hardly any other kind of fiction, hardly any other view of life, could appeal more strongly to the sixteenth century novel-reader and novel-writer than the ornate, spectacular, rhetorical, sentimental, fortuitous medley which we have been attempting to characterize. The Renaissance, in its uncritical acceptance of everything Greek and Roman as *ipso facto* classical, felt at liberty to choose according to its own unquiet taste, and thus established and for centuries maintained among the canons of classicism the late works of Alexandria and of the Hellenized and Romanized Orient—works which today are perceived not to be classical at all.'

When he turns to the English writers to see in what proportions they have drawn on the Greek romances, Dr Wolff shows an admirable caution. In the case of Lyly for instance, though he brings him in contact with the Greek romance-writers through Boccaccio's 'Tito and Gisippo,' he will not commit himself to the position that Lyly's style is indebted to them directly. A less careful man might perhaps have made that position appear very plausible. This caution lends weight to the author's positive conclusions in regard to the *Arcadia*. 'Its material in plot and character, however diffuse and various, is held firmly within the Heliodorean frame; its descriptive matter is strongly flavoured with the Greek Romance *ἑκφρασις*; its structure has been deliberately recast' (i.e. as seen by comparing the *Arcadia* of 1590 with the 'Old *Arcadia*' of which three manuscripts were found by Mr Dobell) 'in the mould of Heliodorus; its style speaks with the voice of the Greek Romancers. Sidney has domesticated the *genre*.' Greene, as Dr Wolff holds, began by transcribing unessential details from Achilles Tatius, but in *Pandosto*, in which story the influence of Greek romances upon him is strongest, while he takes a little from Achilles Tatius, he 'gets structure as well as matter from the solid Heliodorus, together with incident and ornament from the decorative Longus.' Nashe appears to make no use whatever of the Greek romances and Lodge to confine himself to two allusions to the *Æthiopica*.

These conclusions are not lightly arrived at, and after one has read the evidence for them one is not disposed to quarrel with the author's judgment. Almost the only sentence in the book which seems to show a tendency to make too much of resemblances between authors, is one, p. 455, relating to the incident of the hunt in *The Winter's Tale*, III, iii, which is not found in *Pandosto*. Dr Wolff argues that Shakespeare found it in Day's version of *Daphnis and Chloe*—'There is no reason to suppose that Shakespeare invented it, when it lay ready to his hand' there. But Dr Wolff shows that the hunt-incident gives just the

causation required. Why should Shakespeare's invention be supposed to stop at this point, when we have no other reason for supposing that he had any other source for *The Winter's Tale* than Greene's story?

Dr Wolff writes in a free style, with an occasional condescension to colloquial turns, but no empty pretentiousness. Valuable and suggestive criticism is often stowed away even in his notes. The book is provided with a bibliography and a full index; but it would have been an assistance to the reader if the running title of the book had been dispensed with, and in place of it every page had been headed by an indication of its main topic. The book would also have been more handy if it had been divided into two volumes.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

Rich's 'Apolonius & Silla,' an Original of Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night.' Edited by MORTON LUCE. (The Shakespeare Library.) 1912. 8vo. xii + 96 pp.

It will be a satisfaction to all students of English that Mr Morton Luce has so far recovered from illness as to be able to make another contribution to our knowledge of Elizabethan literature. In reprinting Barnabe Rich's *Apolonius & Silla*, he has not only made accessible an Elizabethan story which is interesting in itself, but he has put the general reader in a better position to consider the question of the sources of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*. By way of further assistance Mr Luce has provided an Introduction, in which he sets forth the different versions of the *Gli Ingannati* story, gives extracts from several of them, and indicates points in which Shakespeare may be thought to have owed something to one or another. Mr Luce believes that Shakespeare was acquainted with versions of the story in several languages, and while he took Rich's tale as his chief source, he drew on *Gli Ingannati* for the comedy and on Bandello for the romance of his play. He thinks further that he took the name 'Cesario' from Gonzaga's *Gli Inganni*, and a suggestion or two from the French of Belleforest, and possibly also from the Cambridge Latin play *Laelia*. Many will prefer to look on some of the resemblances between Shakespeare's comedy and the other works as accidental, and will perhaps doubt the poet's ability or inclination to draw at the same time from Italian, French and Latin sources. But I believe that anyone who carefully considers the evidence of *Twelfth Night* will find it very difficult to account for the facts on the theory that Shakespeare's only source was *Apolonius & Silla*.

It is a pity that Mr Luce's final corrections of his manuscript somehow failed to be printed, and that it has been necessary to insert a list of Errata, which in itself is not quite exhaustive.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Poems of John Cleveland. Edited by JOHN M. BERDAN. New Haven: Yale University Press. (London: Henry Frowde. 1911.) 8vo. 270 pp.

This, so far as we know, is the first modern edition of Cleveland's poetical work, and we owe thanks to Mr Berdan for giving it to us, because though Cleveland was undoubtedly a bad writer, he was bad in an interesting manner, and some knowledge of him is necessary to the student of English literature. He represented the faults of the 'metaphysical' poets in an extreme form, and at the same time he is the first English political satirist of any note. The extent to which he appealed to the taste of his age on one or other of these grounds is indicated by the very numerous editions of his poems from 1647 to 1689. Everyone knows Dryden's references to him in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, and the word 'Clevelandism,' which Dryden coins to express the peculiar abuse of language which was characteristic of him; and we are familiar with the quotations from him in Johnson's 'Life of Cowley,' where he is cited in company with Donne and Cowley as a shocking example: but few have gone much further, and 'The Rebel Scot,' once so famous, is left unread.

Mr Berdan adopts the edition of 1677 as the basis of his text, and is duly cautious of admitting poems not accepted as Cleveland's by the editors of that edition, which was undertaken with the avowed purpose of separating the genuine works from those which had been foisted upon him. He publishes nevertheless a section of poems which, not being in the edition of 1677, have been 'attributed to Cleveland by modern scholars,' only one of which, the lines on Ben Jonson printed in *Jonsonus Virbius*, seems to be certainly his, though the *News from Newcastle* is very much in his manner. Mr Berdan gives a very useful tabular statement of the poems included in the various editions, and he also supplies collations of the text of a good many, though without any sufficiently clear statement of the principles on which he has worked. But the most difficult portion of the editor's task in this case is the annotation. Cleveland was difficult even to readers of his own day: 'we cannot read a verse of Cleveland's,' says Eugenius in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, 'without making a face at it, as if every word were a pill to swallow: he gives us many times a hard nut to break our teeth, without a kernel for our pains.' And the difficulty has been much increased for us moderns by the personal and political references, which to readers of his day were easily intelligible. The editor has given us some assistance, but we need a good deal more: many difficulties are left unexplained in his notes, some are explained wrongly, and in some cases the notes are superfluous or irrelevant. It is superfluous, for example, to annotate 'Stagirite,' 'Pelops,' 'Cacus,' &c.; and it is beside the mark to illustrate the lines,

Like Royston crows, who are (as I may say)
Friars of both the Orders, Black and Gray,

by an anecdote intended to suggest the superior cunning of the Royston crow, when all that Cleveland refers to is its combination of black and grey plumage. With regard to omissions we may note that in the lines 'On the Memory of Mr Edward King' there is no note on ll. 31 f.,

An ominous legacy, that did portend
Thy fate and predecessor's second end,

nor on the succeeding passage about the parallel kinds produced on earth and in the sea. (We may note also that the couplet,

Books, arts and tongues were wanting, but in thee
Neptune hath got an university,

is unfortunately misprinted.) In 'Rupertismus' there is no note on ll. 59 f.,

He who the old philosophy controls
That voted down plurality of souls!

though the sentence construction and the reference are both obscure. Again, such a phrase as 'Enjoy a copyhold of victory' (l. 156) ought surely to have been dealt with, and the curse 'Now Rupert take thee, rogue,' (which moreover is punctuated wrongly), might well have had some illustration.

There are some positive errors; e.g. in the poem 'To the State of Love' the author says,

It was a she so glittering bright,
You'd think her soul an Adamite;
A person of so rare a frame,
Her body might be lined with the same.

That is, probably, her soul was so bright that it seemed to dispense with its clothing of body, and yet her outward frame was so beautiful that it might have served instead of a soul, her body might have been sufficiently 'lined' with its mere physical beauty. The editor's note could hardly be worse: 'There is no noun for *with the same* except Adamite; here [the author] seems to confuse that word with *adamant*, which in its double meaning of attraction and diamond, exactly gives the sense.' Again just below we read,

Not the fair Abbess of the skies
With all her nunnery of eyes
Can shew me such a glorious prize!

where the editor says, 'Juno is the *Abbess of the Skies*, and her bird is the peacock.' But surely the 'Abbess of the Skies' is the Moon, and 'her nunnery of eyes' the stars, over which she seems coldly and purely to preside. On p. 107 'inceptor' means one who is about to take his (M.A.) degree, not a freshman, as suggested doubtfully in the note: on p. 147 'collegiates' does not mean 'collections,' but simply members of an assembly or collection, and offers no difficulty. On the other hand Mr Berdan is undoubtedly right, as against the Oxford Dictionary and other authorities, in his explanation of 'he's a galliard by himself'

as applied to Selden in 'The Mixed Assembly,' l. 88. The talk is of dancing, and to each lay member an ecclesiastical partner is assigned, except to Selden, who has to dance by himself because none can match him,

there's more divines in him
Than in all this, their Jewish Sanhedrin.

This mention of a galliard as a 'pas de seul' may be illustrated from the poem 'Upon an Hermaphrodite,' l. 57 f.,

Nor is't a galliard danced by one,
But a mixed dance, though alone.

On the whole we may say that, in spite of faults and omissions, this is a helpful book to the student of English Literature.

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Traherne's Poems of Felicity. Edited from the MS. by H. I. BELL.
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xli + 150 pp.

It is now some nine years since Mr Bertram Dobell startled the literary world by the discovery and the publication of the poems of Thomas Traherne. Traherne, known to a few curious students as a divine, may be said to have come to his own as a poet by accident, for it was by the merest chance that a manuscript once in the possession of Dr Grosart came into Mr Dobell's hands. Mr Dobell's identification of the authorship of the poems was, in its way, quite a triumphant piece of work, and a note of triumph ran through the entire preface in which he introduced the long-forgotten poet to the world. It is strange to think that, while the appearance of Mr Dobell's edition was due to a lucky find on a second-hand bookstall, there lay all the time in the British Museum another, and a fuller, manuscript of Traherne's poems. It is this manuscript which Mr Bell has edited and published in this little volume under the title which it actually bears, 'Poems of Felicity'—'felicity' being, by the way, one of Traherne's pet words in both his prose and his poetry. The text of Mr Bell's manuscript is not always satisfactory, and differs in many places, and often for the worse, from that published by Mr Dobell. This appears to be due to the fact that the manuscript is written by the hand of the poet's brother, Philip, and that the poems were 'prepared' by him for the press. The main value of Mr Bell's volume, however, lies in the new poems which it contains. Not indeed that they will add anything to Traherne's reputation as established by Mr Dobell's edition. There is nothing here surpassing the best of what we already knew of Traherne's poems, but there is much, as Mr Bell holds, that is equal to that best. Mr Dobell, pardonably enough in the first flush of discovery, claimed that 'neither Herbert, Crashaw nor Vaughan can

compare with Traherne in the most essential qualities of poetry.' Mr Bell's estimate of Traherne's poetical qualities is much nearer the mark when he says that 'it is probably true that Traherne is not primarily a poet at all. His verse is full of the material of poetry; it is continually preparing (so to say) to pass into poetry, and here and there for a few lines, sometimes for longer, it does so; but for the most part it remains imperfectly fused; the lyrical impulse is insufficient to convert the thought into the fine gold of poetry, and we get the impression rather of imaginative thought turned into verse than of a naturally poetic inspiration finding its inevitable expression.'

Traherne has a closer kinship, perhaps, with Henry Vaughan than with any other of his contemporaries; but it is easy to exaggerate the resemblances between them. Indeed, the manuscript afterwards secured by Mr Dobell narrowly escaped publication as an undiscovered collection of Vaughan's poems. Long before it came into Mr Dobell's hands, the manuscript was actually shewn to me by the late Dr Grosart, who had just got hold of it—and that was at a bookstall, too,—and talked with enthusiasm about a new edition of Vaughan's poems which he was then projecting, and which was to include his newly-acquired treasures! Traherne has had long to wait for his due recognition as a poet; and, by a strange irony, the discovery of his poems led almost immediately to the discovery that his prose-writings were better than his poetry. For there is nothing in these 'Poems of Felicity' equal as poetry to the beautiful prose of *Centuries of Meditations*.

W. LEWIS JONES.

BANGOR.

Les Sœurs Brontë. By E. DIMNET. Paris: Bloud. 1911. 8vo. xii + 272 pp.

There is always a special interest in the literary criticism of one nation by another. We stand in too close a relationship to those of our own race for us to be certain of seeing them in proper perspective, and the difference in point of view which a difference of nationality inevitably implies is of the greatest possible value in estimating a writer. The series of *Grands écrivains étrangers*, to which M. Dimnet's study of the Brontë family belongs, is intended primarily for French readers, and therefore lays stress upon the French point of view, and for this very reason it has a peculiar interest and value for English students of literature. *Les Sœurs Brontë* has little to add to the known facts of the lives of the Brontës, and its actual criticism of their works is somewhat superficial. The rugged, passionate verse of Currer, Ellis, and Acton Bell is ill-suited for translation into French—though M. Dimnet's renderings show wonderful sympathy with the spirit of the originals—and a synopsis of *Jane Eyre* or *Wuthering Heights* gives but a slight idea of their extraordinary vitality. But when M. Dimnet compares the works of Charlotte Brontë with those of George Sand, or passes from a discussion

of the melodramatic elements in *Jane Eyre* to a criticism of modern French realism, he has much to say that is stimulating and suggestive. 'Vous vous accommodez parfaitement de livres sans caractères, ni vérité profonde et ramassée, ni intérêt d'aucune sorte, pourvu qu'ils ressemblent exactement à la vie de Pierre ou de Jacques,' might as aptly refer to many of our own would-be realistic studies as to those of our neighbours, and in a sentence M. Dimnet reveals one of the most striking qualities of genius as opposed to talent, that of expressing the individuality of what it depicts. Lowood is a charity school, a type, and yet it is Lowood and no other place.

The influence of Haworth itself, and of the strange, lonely life led by the three girls, is well brought out. In a few points the author differs from Mrs Gaskell, and his insistence on the gentle and softening character of the south-west of England is evidently the result of hearsay rather than of knowledge. The book, however, forms a useful and interesting introduction to the work of the Brontës, and will be read with pleasure by those whose need for an introduction of any sort is long passed.

GRACE E. HADOW.

CIRENCESTER.

Der Cambridger Psalter. Herausgegeben von KARL WILDHAGEN.
1. Text mit Erklärungen. (*Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*,
VII Band.) Hamburg: Henri Grand. 1910. 8vo. xxiii + 416 pp.

The chief feature of this edition is the great attention paid to the Latin portions of the Psalter. Here Dr Wildhagen's object is twofold; first to give a restored text; and secondly to indicate the places where the present Psalter varies not only from the *Psalterium Romanum*, or the *Psalterium Gallicum*, but from the other Latin Psalters discussed by Rahlfs¹. The Old English glosses are treated on similar lines. Having sought to restore the text, the editor gives variants, first from the *Vespasian Glosses*, and then from all other extant Psalter glosses with which a relationship can be claimed, including even those yet unpublished. For the execution of this design, Dr Wildhagen has found an invaluable ally in his printer, who has devised the means of distinguishing two parallel texts of Latin and English, each with its set of footnotes, and each bristling with an array of variants, omissions, and additions. The triumph is due to the use of an extraordinary variety of type, brackets, underlines, and so on; and since the editor does not conceal his own feelings on the outward appearance of the book, we venture to add that its pages often recall to us vividly those of a *Kursbuch*.

This is, then, the most elaborate edition of an Old English Psalter yet published; and herein lies its cardinal fault. In a word, too much is attempted. The value of a careful study of the Latin text on the

¹ A. Rahlfs, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, Göttingen, 1907.

part of an editor, whose chief concern may be the English glosses, is obvious; but after all, this is primarily an edition of certain Old English glosses, and when Dr Wildhagen crowds his footnotes with variants from other Latin Psalters, the connexion of which with ours is often extremely remote, or when he gives the Hebrew original of a Latin reading, we feel that he is endeavouring to do too much. We feel also that he is getting out of his depth. He admits that his knowledge of the Latin Psalters is obtained second-hand, and it is no less clear (cf. pp. 48, 79) that he 'has not the Hebrew.' In dealing with the Old English portions of the text, Dr Wildhagen is on safer ground, but he again fails to escape the charge of excessive elaboration. It was obviously right to devote all attention to the Vespasian Glosses, but the time was hardly ripe for attempting an elaborate comparison with other Psalters, particularly with those extant only in manuscript. Each fresh edition of an Old English Psalter shows the peculiar difficulty attached to this kind of work, and it is idle to pretend that the hasty collation which we have here of the Psalters still unprinted, can have a permanent value. The footnotes are more explanatory than those belonging to the Latin text; and together with much that is sound, they show signs of haste and fancifulness. Dr Wildhagen seems to have a mania for discovering new words. Thus (Ps. lxii, 8) a note on *ic gystige*, written over *exultabo*, runs: "...Ich stelle das Verbum zu ae. *giest* 'Hefe,' 'Schaum' und verstehe: 'ich schäume über (sc. vor Freude).'" It is surely more reasonable to suppose that *exulabo* was read. Or again (Ps. xxxv, 4), when confronted with *word mine his* over *Verba oris eius*, the editor rightly suggests that the second word is due to an unconscious repetition of the familiar combination *word mine*, but cannot help adding "Immerhin möchte ich nicht unterlassen, auf das Kelt. *min* 'Mund,' 'Lippe' (Breton, Welsch, *min*, etc.) hinzuweisen."

In his general attitude to the text, Dr Wildhagen is conservative to a fault. Even mis-spellings, though corrected by the same hand, are restored. In the Latin much trouble is spent over the variations between *-ti-* and *-ci-*, and our editor is ready with his asterisk to mark such innocent forms as *set*, *quot*, *temtauerunt*. On the other hand, Old English spellings are left in all their lawlessness. Where, however, a form appears rare or hitherto unrecorded, it is enshrined in an appendix. Here the list, imposing at first sight, requires curtailment, or the asterisk (now a danger-signal) might have been much more freely used. Many words in this list reappear in the corresponding places in other Psalters. Too much importance is attached to variations between the prefixes *of-*, *on-*, *a-*, which were confused together in the language of this period; and a distinction between the uses of *up-* and *ut-* as separable or inseparable prefixes, can hardly be maintained. Lastly, forms like *forcumān* (*praeuenire*), *geleacan* (to have in common!), *neftcyrrēnd* (*non rediens*), are set forth without any warning. In short Dr Wildhagen is clearly apt to place too much trust in his scribe.

In frankly anticipating some of the criticisms here offered, Dr Wildhagen submits that allowance should be made him for having

done his work on a peculiarly elaborate scale. His claim is just, and his diligence has been most praiseworthy, but the execution of the work makes it questionable whether some of the results will have the value he expects.

It must be added that to the volume is prefixed a portrait and memoir of the late Professor Wülker.

A. O. BELFOUR.

BELFAST.

A Shakespeare Glossary. By C. T. ONIONS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. 8vo. xii + 259 pp.

This must be regarded as one of the by-products of the *New English Dictionary*, and it is a very valuable one. Mr Onions has been for many years one of the staff employed upon that great undertaking, and now that it is approaching its completion, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press have authorized the issue of this volume, which is mainly based upon it. It is not a complete Shakespeare Dictionary, but it aims at recording and explaining all uses of words which offer any difficulty, or are in any way different from modern practice, and Mr Onions has interpreted this limitation in such a manner that very few words escape him altogether. The greatest danger of misunderstanding for the inexperienced reader of the text of Shakespeare lies in the words which are current in modern use, but in a somewhat different sense; and as a means of setting him on his guard against this, the student will do well to read a few pages here and there of Mr Onions' Glossary. His eyes will almost certainly be opened to many things which he would not otherwise have noticed. The word 'conclusion' for example, as it occurs in the phrase 'to try conclusions' (*Hamlet*, III, iv, 195) or even in *Cymb.* I, v, 18,

is't not meet
That I did amplify my judgement in
Other conclusions?

might well pass unobserved, with a vague application of one or other of the modern meanings. But when our attention is called to other passages in which it occurs, as *Ant. and Cleop.* v, ii, 356,

She hath pursued conclusions infinite
Of easy ways to die,

we see at once that the Elizabethan meaning 'experiment' is that which best suits all these passages, and probably also *Othello*, I, iii, 334,

the blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us to most preposterous conclusions.

So also 'a foregone conclusion' in *Othello*, III, iii, 429, meaning 'a previous experiment,' but this last passage is rather strangely omitted by Mr Onions under 'conclusion,' though given under 'foregone.' Again, the

words of *Hamlet*, III, iv, 52, 'what act that roars so loud and thunders in the index?' may easily have a wrong meaning attached to them by the modern reader, unless he is reminded that an 'index' for the Elizabethans was a table of contents prefixed to a book, hence a 'prologue,' 'preface,' as in *Troilus*, I, iii, 343, *Othello*, II, i, 265. When Romeo says of philosophy, 'It helps not, it prevails not,' it is not superfluous that we should be told that 'prevails' here is equivalent to 'avails' (cp. 'this unprevailing woe' in *Hamlet*). Mr Onions has done his work very well, both in such cases as we have referred to, and in the explanation of more obvious difficulties, and he warns his reader by appropriate signs where there is doubt or dispute about an interpretation, or where the reading of the text is questionable. Some various readings which are certainly erroneous are nevertheless allowed a place in the text, because they have been adopted in many editions, as Pope's conjecture 'marish' in I *Henry VI*, I, i, 50, where the original 'nourish,' in the sense of 'nurse,' is now admitted to be correct. Mr Onions claims to have been able, either with the help of the *New English Dictionary* or from other resources, to explain many things more correctly or more fully than previous glossarists have done: e.g. 'I love a ballad in print alive,' i.e. 'dearly' (from 'lief') where most editors read 'o' life'; 'to relish a love-song like a robin-redbreast,' where 'relish,' which is ignored in most of the glossaries, has been shewn to be a musical term meaning 'warble,' or 'sing with variations.' He has also paid special attention to the relation of Shakespeare's vocabulary to that of the dialect of the Midlands, and especially of his own county, Warwickshire, as illustrated by not a few words, as 'ballow,' 'batlet,' 'chop' (in the sense of 'thrust'), 'geck,' 'grow to,' 'mobled,' 'muss,' 'sight' (for the pupil of the eye), 'tarre,' etc.

Naturally there are some cases in which we disagree with Mr Onions. We will take a few examples from *Hamlet*. The interpretation of 'flushing' as 'redness,' in I, ii, 155, is probably wrong: the expression 'Had left the flushing' means apparently 'had ceased to flow.' In I, iv, 9 Mr Onions (with the *N. E. D.*) takes 'reels' as a noun: but it is much more probably a verb, either transitive or intransitive. In III, i, 83 Mr Onions understands 'conscience' in the ordinary modern meaning, 'sense of right and wrong,' whereas it must surely mean here 'thought,' 'reflection,' as the context shews¹. It is well that Mr Onions should explain 'sables,' in III, ii, 139, as the (brown) fur of the sable, worn on rich garments, and opposed to mourning, 'Nay then, let the devil wear black, for I'll have a suit of sables,' but there is surely no reason to suspect quibbling, which is quite out of place here. (The *N. E. D.* deals with it under the head of 'sable' = 'black,' but the later instances of 'sables' in the sense of mourning garments are probably influenced by a misunderstanding of this passage.) There are not many omissions in this book, but a reference should have been given to *Lear*, IV, vi, 227 for 'pregnant to,' in the sense of 'disposed to,' and notice might have

¹ In these cases Mr Onions should at least use the asterisk which indicates a doubtful solution.

been taken of 'your,' as used in the phrase 'your worm is your only emperor for diet,' 'your water is a sore decayer of your whoreson dead body,' and perhaps also in

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

On the whole we can commend this Shakespeare glossary as the best thing of the kind that has appeared, and as very well fitted to take the place of explanatory notes for those whose object is simply to understand the text. In most cases the conspectus of Shakespearean usage which is afforded by such a glossary as this, is far more valuable than the information which is given by a note, and the convenient size of the book and its cheapness ought to make it suitable for general use.

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Works of Thomas Deloney. Edited with an introduction and notes by FRANCIS OSCAR MANN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. xliii + 600 pp.

Mr Mann has rendered a service to Thomas Deloney and to all who can read Elizabethan literature with pleasure. While others have raised the old writer from the ranks of the ballad-mongers to the dignity and estate of an Elizabethan novelist, Mr Mann has established this position in the only final and effective way, by gathering together his author's fugitive efforts into a well printed volume with scholarly notes and an appreciative introduction. At the same time, Mr Mann has put a collection of lively and amusing tales within the reach of this studious generation. For it is something, after studying Nashe's overwrought and erudite tirades or the introspective melancholy of Lyly and Greene, to turn to these stories still fresh with the simplicity of an earlier age, picturing the cheerful aspects of middle class life, telling us of the amusements of 'prentices, their sports, quarrels, love affairs, the *camaraderie* of the guilds, the tricks they played on one another, and the pride they took in their work. Deloney, in spite of what Mr Mann says, was not a realist. The picture is idealised, for we know well from contemporary pamphleteers that the age of Elizabeth was even further from the millennium than our own times. And yet, though Deloney throws over his narratives a zest and an optimism, which was the very soul of the mediæval *raconteurs*, his view of life is not confined to the bright side of things. If he tells of penniless 'prentices who married their mistresses or even rose to be Lord Mayor, he also tells of princes and princesses who stooped to be cobblers and serving-maids, of lads who had not the wherewithal to buy a meal, of noblemen who were imprisoned and tortured, and of one ghastly murder which even now makes the reader's flesh creep (*Thomas of Reading*,

chap. xi). There is little or none of the continuity of episodes and development of characters which we expect in a modern novel. *Jacke of Newberie*, *The Gentle Craft* and *Thomas of Reading* are hardly more than pegs on which a number of independent and traditional stories are hung. The charm of the work consists in its directness and vivacity of narration, or again in the skill with which, in *The Gentle Craft, Part I* (his most ambitious attempt at a fashionable book, enriched with the learning of Pliny and the new ideas of the time) he alternates chapters of euphuistic romance with popular drolleries. Sometimes we meet with touches of character which would not be out of place in the best nineteenth century novels, as for instance in the picture of the old friar who could not say mass without his book and spectacles, though he was blind, and in the description of the disreputable, bedraggled host of Bosome's Inn. Above all, Deloney excels in reproducing chance bits of conversation which give glimpses into the speaker's whole manner of life and habit of thought. It would be hard to beat the passage in which Simon Eyer's wife rates her 'prentice Crispine for marrying at his age, or where she describes her consciousness of social advancement when invited to the Lord Mayor's supper, or urges her husband to accept the office of sheriff; or again, the passages where Meg and Gillian exchange amenities, and where the two gallants, with a *ῥήψς* soon to be followed by *νέμεσις*, boast to each other of the things that they will do to 'lusty Peachey' the master shoemaker; or yet again, the gossip of the housewives (*Thomas of Reading*, chap. xii), varying between the vulgarity of ignorance and the ignorance of superstition; or lastly the fragment of dialogue in which the erratic Tom Drum, 'sitting on a time sadly at work in his masters shop,' is seized with the *Wanderlust* and 'suddenly shrowded up St Hughes bones (i.e. his cobbler's implements) and taking downe his pike-staffe, clapt his pack at his back' informing his employer that he could not stay indoors while the spring sun was shining and the trees were 'deckt with green leaves.'

Thus there are qualities in Deloney's work which should appeal to the most general reader, who cannot enjoy the rather artificial pleasure of recognising familiar allusions in a new author. At the same time Mr Mann's edition is destined primarily for scholars and his first duty is to enable the serious student to see Deloney in his true relation to the literature of the time. With this end in view, he begins with a life of Deloney, about whom, as he shows, very little is known, although he adds a large number of allusions to his author from contemporary writers. Then follows a rather intricate account of the sources and development of Elizabethan prose fiction. Mr Mann shows well how the sixteenth century did not improve on the narrative art of earlier centuries, except in abandoning verse for prose, and why the atmosphere of Elizabethan times hardly favoured the development of the novel in its highest forms. He then traces the two main streams of medieval literature—the romances and epics which appealed to the aristocracy, and the *exempla* and *fabliaux* which the middle classes loved

—and he explains how they reappeared on the one hand in euphuism and prose pastorals, and on the other hand in jest books, ‘coney-catching’ pamphlets and the first attempts at the picaresque novel. Deloney, he concludes, differed from, or surpassed, Greene, Nashe and others because he ‘attains a clearness of construction and homogeneity of atmosphere which is missing in most contemporary fiction; for he writes straightforwardly, from a simple point of view, fitting his stories into an appropriate framework, and informing them with the same vivid life, so that the whole novel is one in atmosphere, if not in connected incident.’ In the same way he concludes his introduction by an appreciation of Deloney’s poetry, saying something about the character and origin of ballad-sellers and the quality of their work.

Such a sketch of an important field of literature—though, in this case, the sketch is rather diffused and complex—is especially useful when followed by an annotated text of an author who illustrates the principles laid down. Mr Mann explains adequately the allusions and obsolete expressions which confront the reader, and it is a perfect scandal that a commentary which provides so many illustrations to the chroniclers and to Shakespeare, should have no index. But his notes are most instructive where he shows the sources on which Deloney drew for his novels and ballads.

And yet, in spite of the useful information which Mr Mann, with scholarly diligence, has gathered together, we doubt whether he is really familiar with the popular thought and sentiment of the period. Every now and then we meet with gaps which a fuller knowledge would surely have supplied. He might have noticed the similarity between the episode in chap. IV of *Jacke of Newberie* ‘How the maidens serued Will Sommers for his sawcinesse’ and several escapades in the Jest-books and *Fabliaux*. He might have shown how ‘the pictures which Jacke of Newberie had in his house’ in chap. V are introduced to gratify the popular taste for *encomia*, of which the most conspicuous example is *Lenten Stufte*. He should have given a fuller note on Brainford (*The Gentle Craft, The Second Part*, chap. XI) which figured so largely in the people’s sentiment. In *Thomas of Reading* he twice misses an obvious occasion (i.e. chaps. II and VI) to draw the reader’s attention to the popularity of satires on women such as we find in *The Schole-houise of Women, The Proude Wyves Paternoster* and S. Rowland’s *Tis Merrie when Gossips meete*. A similar omission is to be found with reference to the song ‘In praise of a single life’ in *The Garland of good Will*. Crab’s prophecy (*Thomas of Reading*, p. 236) should have been compared with broadside prophecies which at that time were sold in the streets and the prognostications which prominent literary men like Nashe, Breton, Waldegrave and Wither produced. The device by which Sir William Ferris was cured of his obsession (*Thomas of Reading*, p. 253) is far older than the *Decameron* (p. 549). It was known to the physicians of classical times and is described in Reginald Scot’s *Dis-couerie of Witchcraft*.

Mr Mann’s introduction has several flashes of wit and insight above

the level of the average commentator, but, like the notes, it is not free from lapses. While it is certainly true that prose is the more suitable medium for the novel, the reader would hardly have been convinced of this truth by Mr Mann's unaided arguments. To imply that the Elizabethan novel 'embraces aspects of human life hostile to poetic treatment,' will hardly convince the reader who recalls how great poets have treated such episodes and characters as Thersites, Gorgo, Corydon, and Sir Kay, not to mention obvious instances drawn from *The Romance of the Rose*, *The Canterbury Tales*, *Hermann und Dorothea*, or *Don Juan*. To say that 'Greene, like Deloney, while using the plainer English for ordinary occasions, *relapses* (the italics are ours) into the euphuistic method immediately he takes in hand a romantic subject,' rather reminds one of the familiar proceeding known as putting the cart before the horse. When suggesting the sources of *Merry Tales*, Mr Mann might have mentioned that the compiler almost certainly drew on Erasmus's *Convivium Fabulosum* and *Apophthegmata* and on Poggio's *Facetiae*, and in showing how the jest books foreshadowed the picaresque novel, we cannot imagine why he omitted so important a link as the *Jestes of George Peele*. With regard to Elizabethan vagabond literature, it is by no means certain that 'Dekker added little to his stolen material but the ornamentation of exuberant fancy,' while 'Greene worked into his 'coney-catching' pamphlets much of his own seamy experience.' Some of Dekker's material is as untraceable as Greene's, and though the life history of both bohemians is lamentably scanty, we know that the author of *The Bellman* did not lack opportunities of studying roguery at first hand.

Some readers may regard it as an even more serious defect that this essay goes over the ground covered by other scholars, without referring to their work. When saying that Deloney's novels 'deserved a recognition less belated' (p. xxxi), Mr Mann might have admitted that they were fully recognised three years ago in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Vol. III, chap. xvi). If he goes out of his way to state that 'with Petty, and not with Lyly, as M. Jusserand would persuade us, we enter upon the prose literature of the drawing-room' (p. xx) he should have added that Professors Atkins and Feuillerat had already revealed that origin of euphuism. When describing the character of the Elizabethan ballad (p. xxxvii) he should not have omitted mention of the essay prefacing the *Shirburn Ballads*, especially as his own estimate is similar to that of Mr Clark. When he says that 'the continuity of the medieval and Tudor ages has been strangely overlooked' (p. xviii), he himself even more strangely overlooks the research of the last few years. In spite of such blemishes, Mr Mann's edition is meritorious, and the present writer emphasises these details only because the book must soon be in the hands of every serious student of the novel and, it is hoped, of many less specialised readers as well.

H. V. ROUTH.

CAMBRIDGE.

MINOR NOTICES.

The Divine Poet is beloved of the great ones of the earth, and the *Divine Comedy* has been the delight, and the literary hobby of many of the most eminent men of the last few generations. In *The Divina Commedia of Dante Alighieri, literally translated into English Verse in the hendecasyllabic measure of the original Italian* by the Rt Hon. Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, we have the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia turning his hand to that very difficult, but fascinating task—an attempt to supersede, or to supplement, the standard English translations of the *Divina Commedia*.

He starts with a high ideal of what translation means, in loyalty, and in self-effacement; and he realises that if identity of measure is to be attempted, rhyme must be abandoned. So instead of the more usual decasyllable with *terza rima* or less complicated rhyme, we have here a faithful reproduction—as faithful as circumstances will permit—of the rhythm of Dante's verse. It has come to be taken for granted that a sustained series of hendecasyllables would prove banal or ridiculous, though a page or so might be tolerable, as a *tour de force*. A perusal of this volume challenges one to consider whether such a judgement is not too hasty and too sweeping. The more one reads, the less one is inclined to criticize; and though the first impression is that of loss of dignity and solemnity, the feeling grows that, after all, the majesty of Dante's verse is built up of that common speech and phraseology of everyday persons, which was one of the reasons for the title 'Commedia.'

It may interest the reader to see how a favourite passage looks in this home-spun garb. We take the beginning of *Purg.* viii.

Now was the hour that fond desire awakens
 In those at sea, and fills the heart with yearning
 The day they bid Good-bye to friends beloved,
 And pricks with love the new-departed pilgrim,
 If the church-bell he heareth in the distance
 That seems to mourn the day as it is dying....

L. R.

In his monograph, *Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1912), Mr Earle Bradsher gives us an interesting review of the state of the book trade in America between 1784 and 1839. Carey was a man of exceptional intelligence and public spirit, and a publisher whose fair dealing was acknowledged even by authors; and he unquestionably rendered great services to the literature of his adopted country. Perhaps the most interesting portions of this essay are those which deal with the competition of American publishers for advance copies of books published in England, the *Waverley Novels*, for example. With fifteen or twenty days' start, Carey's

firm could undertake to obtain the absolute command of the American market, and as much as £75 was sometimes paid to Messrs Constable for such an advance copy. The following extract from a letter to the agents in London, dated June, 1823, illustrates the state of things fairly well:

We have received 'Quentin Durward' most handsomely and have the Game completely in our own hands this time....In two days we shall publish it here [Philadelphia] and in New York, and the Pirates may print it as soon as they please. The opposition Edition will be out in about 48 hours after they have one of our Copies, but we shall have complete and entire possession of every market in the Country for a short time. Independently of profit, it is in the highest degree gratifying to be able to manage the matter in our own way without fear of interference....It frequently happens that we are 70 or 80 days without intelligence from England. One day will bring a vessel in 60 days, next day in 50 and the following day one in 40 or 35, so that our 15 or 20 days are completely lost to us. We are very desirous of taking every precaution against losing the advantage for which we pay so heavily, and which is lost unless we have a few days' start, as we cannot bring the book into the Market so soon as the opposition. They publish as soon as they can have ten Copies from the press, while we cannot until we have at least 2000 or 2500. They print for their own stores. We do it for the supply of a whole country, and we must send off to our correspondents as soon as we publish here. You will please to take all these matters into consideration, and make the best arrangements in your power for us.

The essay, which is largely based on unpublished documents, seems to be carefully put together, and is certainly 'a contribution to knowledge worthy of publication.'

Professor R. P. Cowl edits *An Anthology of Imaginative Prose* (London, Herbert and Daniel) which is certainly a most attractive little volume. It is designed to exemplify the power of English prose as a medium of imaginative or poetic expression, and to illustrate the wealth of our literature in those varieties of prose commonly described as ornate, impassioned, cadenced or rhythmical. The range of selection, from 'Sir John Mandeville' to 'Fiona Macleod,' is sufficiently wide. The largest shares of space are given to Milton, the Authorised Version of the Bible, Ruskin, and Jeremy Taylor (in the order named), and then come Sir Thomas Browne, Burton (who is surely overrated), Donne, and Carlyle. The selections made are almost invariably good, but there are omissions. In the Preface reference is made to 'the inspired prose of a Plato or a Bacon,' yet Bacon is represented only by two extracts from the essay *Of Gardens*, which moreover mostly consist of catalogues of flowers and fruits. The other essays are completely passed over, and yet such passages as the following surely deserve the name of imaginative prose: 'The first creature of God in the works of the days was the light of the sense; the last was the light of reason; and his Sabbath work ever since is the illumination of his Spirit....Certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in Charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of Truth.' 'Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; Adversity is the blessing of

the New: which carrieth the greater benediction and the clearer revelation of God's favour. Yet even in the Old Testament, if you listen to David's harp, you shall hear as many hearselike airs as carols; and the pencil of the Holy Ghost hath laboured more in describing the afflictions of Job than the felicities of Salomon.' 'But little do men perceive what solitude is and how far it extendeth. For a crowd is not company, and faces are but a gallery of pictures, and talk but a tinkling cymbal, where there is no love.' Again, it seems to us that Burke is but scantily honoured in the two short passages which are taken from him, and Landor is insufficiently represented by a bare four pages.

However, we have certainly no desire to quarrel with the book, which is by far the best thing of the kind that we have seen, and of which the paper and printing are worthy of the contents.

Attention is called by the Cambridge University Press to Mr Charles H. Gray's book entitled *Lodowick Carliell* (Chicago University Press, 1905), in which the life and work of that dramatist is investigated, and his best play, *The Deserving Favourite*, is reprinted. The surname is the same as that of Thomas Carlyle, who recognised his kinship with the Carlyles of Bridekirk (not far from Ecclefechan), of whom the dramatist was one. The name was variously spelt Carlell, Carlisle, Carlile and Carliell, but the last form is that which seems to have been used in the author's signatures. The ascertainable facts of his life have been collected by Mr Gray with praiseworthy diligence, and it furnishes an interesting example of the close connexion in the reign of Charles I between the royal household and the stage. Lodowick Carliell was first a groom of the privy chamber and 'Gentleman of the Bows,' and then one of the two keepers of the royal deer park at Richmond, a post which the sporting traditions of his family must have made congenial to him. He was exceptionally fortunate in the fact that he was adequately provided for by pension after the Restoration. His extant plays, produced, with one exception, from 1629 to 1642, are of a romantic character, and to some extent foreshadow the sentiment of the 'heroic' drama, while exhibiting that helpless breakdown of dramatic blank verse which was characteristic of the period. *The Deserving Favourite* is here reprinted from the quarto of 1629, collated with that of 1659. The plot of the play, as the editor shews, is to a great extent drawn from a contemporary Spanish novel. Originally written for the Court, it speedily found its way to the 'common stage,' where it seems to have had some success, and no doubt the improbable disguises and discoveries with which it abounds were very much in accordance with the taste of the time. The author speaks of his 'known want of learning,' but classical allusions are rather frequent and he certainly had some technical skill as a dramatist.

Mr Gray seems to have done his work conscientiously as editor.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June—August, 1912.

GENERAL.

- BERGMANN, K., Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der deutschen, englischen und französischen Sprache auf lexikologischem Gebiete. (Neusprachliche Abhandlungen, xviii.) Dresden, C. A. Koch. 4 M. 40.
- Festschrift zum 15. Neuphilologentage in Frankfurt am Main, 1912. Frankfurt, Gebrüder Knauer.
- LOMMEL, H., Studien über indogermanische Femininbildungen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 M.
- TOPOLOVSEK, J., Die sprachliche Urverwandtschaft der Indogermanen, Semiten und Indianer. Vienna, H. Kirsch. 5 M.
- ZENKER, R., Zur Mabinogionfrage. Eine Antikritik. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- Bibliotheca romanica. No. 154—156. B. Guarini, Opere. Il pastor fido. No. 159, 160. J. J. Rousseau, Les rêveries du promeneur solitaire. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.
- FELLER, J., Notes de philologie wallonne. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.
- MEYER-LÜBKE, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, iii. Reihe.) 4. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Italian.

- ALAGNA, G., Lo spirito nuovo di Giuseppe Parini. Palermo, A. Trimarchi. 1 L. 50.
- ALFIERI, V., Le Tragedie, scelte ed illustrate da M. Scherillo. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.) Milan, U. Hoepli. 1 L. 50.
- BATTISTI, C., Le dentali esplosive intervocali nei dialetti italiani. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxviii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.
- CAPPELLETTI, L., Osservazioni storiche e letterarie e notizie sulle fonti del Decamerone. 2da ediz. Rocca S. Casciano, L. Cappelli. 2 L.
- DE SANCTIS, F., Storia della letteratura italiana a cura di B. Croce. Vol. I, II. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxxi, xxxii.) Bari, G. Laterza. Each 5 L. 50.
- FOLONGO, T., Opere italiane, a cura di U. Renda. Vol. II. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxviii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

- HAUTECEUR, L., Rome et la Renaissance de l'antiquité à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. cv.) Paris, Fontemoing. 18 fr.
- MANZONI, A., Opere. Vol. iv, parte i. Carteggio di A. Manzoni a cura di G. Sforza e G. Gallavresi. Milan, U. Hoepli. 6 L. 50.
- MARINO, G. B., Epistolario, seguito da lettere di altri scrittori del seicento, a cura di A. Borzelli e F. Nicolini. Vol. II. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxix.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.
- MCLEOD, A., Plays and Players in Modern Italy : being a Study of the Italian Stage as affected by the political and social life, manners and characters of to-day. London, Smith, Elder. 7s. 6d. net.
- POLO, M., Il Milione secondo il testo della Crusca, reintegrato con gli altri codici italiani a cura di D. Olivieri. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxx.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.
- SETTIMELLI, E., La critica di B. Croce. (Collezione di saggi critici diretta da B. Corradini e E. Settimelli, II.) . Rome, Athenaeum. 2 L. 50.

Spanish.

- CEJADOR Y FRAUCA, J., Tesoro de la lengua castellana. Lo que dicen las palabras. Sibilantes. I. Parte. Madrid, Paes. 12 pes.
- CERVANTES, M. DE, El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha. Edición y notas de F. Rodríguez Marín. (Clásicos Castellanos.) Madrid, Ediciones de 'La Lectura.' Paris, H. Champion.
- CURZON, H. DE, Un théâtre d'idées en Espagne. Le théâtre de Jose Echegaray. Étude analytique. Paris, Fischbacher. 5 fr.
- MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., Edición paleográfica del Cantar de Mio Cid. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 4 pes.
- PÉREZ PASTOR, C., Noticias y documentos relativos a la Historia y Literatura españolas. Tomo I. Madrid.
- RENNERT, H. A., The Spanish Pastoral Romances. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures.) Philadelphia, Pa.

French.

(a) *General.*

- MEUNIER, J. M., Atlas linguistique et Tableaux des pronoms personnels du Nivernais. Supplément de l'étude morphologique sur les pronoms personnels dans les parlers actuels du Nivernais. Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.
- MEUNIER, J. M., Étude morphologique sur les pronoms personnels dans les parlers actuels du Nivernais. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.
- MEUNIER, J. M., Monographie phonétique du parler de Chaulgnes, Canton de la Charité-sur-Loire. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.
- MEUNIER, J. M., Index lexicographique. Supplément de la monographie phonétique du parler le Chaulgnes (Nièvre). Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.
- SCHINZ, A., Les accents dans l'écriture française, étude critique de leurs diverses fonctions dans le passé et le présent. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.
- SCHOCH, J., Perfectum historicum und Perfectum praesens im Französischen von seinen Anfängen bis 1700. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, iv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 20.
- TOBLER, A., Vermischte Beiträge. Der vermischten Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, 5. Reihe. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 8 M.

WINKLER, É., *La doctrine grammaticale française d'après Maupas et Oudin.* (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxxviii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.

(b) *Old French.*

BENARY, W., *Die germanische Ermanarichsage und die französische Helden-dichtung.* (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xl.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Oldest Monuments of the French Language, The, and the Life of Saint Alexis. Translated with Notes. Oxford, J. Thornton. 3s. 6d. net.

SONDHEIMER, I., *Die Herodes-Partien im lateinischen liturgischen Drama und in den französischen Mysterien.* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, iii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 6 M.

TROYES, CHRESTIEN DE, *Cliges: a Romance.* Translated by L. J. Gardiner. (New Mediaeval Library.) London, Chatto and Windus. 5s. net.

Vilain Mire, *Das altfranzösische Fabel du.* Herausgegeben von C. Zipperling. Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

(c) *Modern French.*

ANTIOCHE, COMTE D', *Chateaubriand, ambassadeur à Londres, 1822, d'après ses dépêches inédites.* Paris, Perrin. 7 fr. 50.

BALDENSPERGER, F., BEAULAVON, G., BENRUBI, J., etc., J. J. Rousseau. *Conférences faites à l'École des Hautes Études Sociales en 1912.* Préface de G. Lanson (Bibl. générale des sciences sociales). Paris, F. Alcan. 6 fr.

BALZAC, H. DE, *La comédie humaine, texte révisé et annoté par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon.* Tomes II, III. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

BERNEBURG, E., *Charakterkomik bei Molière.* (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, x.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 2 M.

BERSAUCOURT, A. DE, *Les pamphlets contre Victor Hugo.* Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

BLAY DE GAÏX, Baron, *Une amie inconnue d'Eugénie de Guérin.* Coraly de Gaïx, correspondance et œuvres. Paris, H. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

BONNEFON, P., *Correspondance de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette.* Tome II. 1729-41. (Société des Textes français modernes.) Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

BRANGSCH, W., *Philosophie und Dichtung bei Sully Prudhomme.* (Normannia, viii.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 50.

BRUNETIÈRE, F., *Histoire de la littérature française classique (1515-1830).* Tome II. Le XVII^e siècle. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. 7 fr. 50.

BUFFENOIR, H., *Les portraits de J. J. Rousseau, étude historique et iconographique.* 2 vols. Paris, Émile-Paul. 30 fr.

DEBRÉ, A., *Die Darstellung der Weltgeistlichkeit bei den französischen Romantikern.* Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M.

DELAFARGE, D., *La vie et l'œuvre de Palissot (1730-1814).* Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

DOUMIC, R., *Lamartine.* (Les grands écrivains français.) Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.

FABRE, J., J. J. Rousseau. Paris, F. Alcan. 2 fr.

FAGUET, É., *Les amies de Rousseau.* Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

FAGUET, É., *Rousseau artiste.* Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

FAGUET, É., *Rousseau penseur.* Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

FONTENELLE, *Textes choisis et commentés par É. Faguet.* (Bibliothèque française.) Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.

- HAAS, J., Balzacs Scènes de la vie privée von 1830. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, II.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 80.
- HÖFFDING, H., J. J. Rousseau et sa philosophie, trad. par J. de Coussange. F. Alcan. 2 fr. 50.
- HUSZAR, G., L'influence de l'Espagne sur le théâtre français des XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles. (Études critiques de littérature comparée, III.) Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.
- KLINCKSIECK, F., Der Brief in der französischen Literatur des 19. Jahrh. Eine Auswahl. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.
- LACHÈVRE, F., Le libertinage au XVII^e siècle. Une seconde revision des œuvres du poète Th. de Viau, publ. en 1663 par Esprit Aubert. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.
- MARTIN-DECAEN, A., Le dernier ami de J. J. Rousseau. Le marquis de Girardin, 1735–1808. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.
- MARTINEAU, H., L'itinéraire de Stendhal. (Collection de la Société des Trente.) Paris, A. Messein. 5 fr.
- MERLANT, J., Un entretien inconnu de George Sand et de Flaubert sur J. J. Rousseau. Paris, Coulet et fils. 1 fr.
- MEYNIER, A., J. J. Rousseau révolutionnaire. Paris, Schleicher frères. 3 fr. 50.
- MONTESQUIEU, Textes choisis et commentés par F. Strowski (Bibliothèque française). Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.
- MORNET, D., Le romantisme en France au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.
- PATERNE BERRICHON, J. A. Rimbaud. Le poète (1854–1873). Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.
- PATTERSON, J. G., A Zola Dictionary : the Characters of the Rougon-Macquart Novels. London, Routledge. 8s. 6d. net.
- PFANDL, L., Abel Hugo und seine französische Übersetzung spanischer Romanzen. Ein Neudruck zur Geschichte der französischen Romantik, mit Einleitung herausgegeben. (Normannia, VI.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 50.
- PLAN, P. P., J. J. Rousseau et Malesherbes. Un dossier de la Direction de la librairie sous Louis XV. Paris, Fischbacher. 3 fr.
- SAILLARD, G., Essai sur la fable en France, au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, A. Picard. 5 fr.
- SAILLARD, G., Florian, sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, A. Picard. 7 fr. 50.
- SCHOMANN, E., Französische Utopisten und ihr Frauenideal. (Normannia, VII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 6 M.
- SÉCHÉ, L., Le cénacle de J. Delorme (1827–1830). Tome I. Victor Hugo et les poètes. Tome II. Victor Hugo et les artistes. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.
- Sources d'idées, Les, XVI^e siècle. Textes choisis et commentés par P. Villey (Bibliothèque française). Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.
- STENDHAL, Œuvres complètes. Édition définitive publ. par E. Champion. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.
- TIERSOT, J., J. J. Rousseau. (Les maîtres de la musique.) Paris, F. Alcan. 3 fr. 50.
- TOUGARD, A., Documents concernant l'histoire littéraire du XVIII^e siècle conservés aux archives de l'Académie de Rouen. Tome I. Rouen, A. Lestringant. 12 fr.

- TOURNOUX, G. A., *Bibliographie Verlainienne. Contribution critique à l'étude des littératures étrangères et comparées.* (Collection bibliographique pour servir à l'histoire du mouvement littéraire contemporain, I.) Leipzig, E. Rowohlt. 7 M. 50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- PANZER, F., *Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte.* II. Sigfrid. Munich, C. H. Beck. 8 M.

Scandinavian.

- AHLSTRÖM, A., *Våra medeltidslagar. Studier i fornsvensk stilistik och prosarytmik.* Lund, Gleerupska bokh. 3 Kr. 50.
- CRUPPI, L., *Femmes écrivains d'aujourd'hui.* Tome I. Suède. Paris, Fayard. 4 fr.
- Edda, *Die Lieder der älteren (Sæmundar Edda).* Herausgegeben von K. Hildebrand. Völlig umgearbeitet von H. Gering. 3. Auflage. (Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler, VII.) Paderborn, Schöningh. 8 M.
- Edda, *Die prosaische, im Auszuge nebst Volsunga-saga und Nornagests-pátt.* Mit ausführlichem Glossar herausg. von E. Wilken. 2. Auflage. I. Teil. Text. (Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler, XI.) Paderborn, Schöningh. 4 M.
- KELLGREN, J. H., *Valda dikter och prosastycken.* Utg. af F. Vetterlund. Stockholm, Bonnier. 1 Kr.
- LYTH, P. G., *Tegnér-studier.* Stockholm, Nordiska bokh. 1 Kr. 25.
- NAUMANN, H., *Altnordische Namenstudien.* (Acta Germanica, Neue Reihe, I.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.
- PALLADIUS, P., *Danske Skrifter.* Udgivet for Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund af L. Jacobsen. 3.—4. Levering. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 Kr. 90.
- ROBERTS, R. E., *Henrik Ibsen: a critical Study.* London, M. Secker. 7s. 6d. net.
- Sprogmindet, *Ældre norske.* Udg. af Den norske historiske kildeskrift-kommission. I. Maallære og ordtøke fraa Vest-Agder, fraa fyrste halvti av 1600 talet. (Handsk. No. 464, 8vo i Thottske samling.) Utg. ved T. Hannaas. II. Ordsamling fraa Robyggjelaget fraa slutten av 1600 talet. (Handsk. No. 1506. 4to i Thottske samling.) Utg. ved T. Hannaas. Kristiania, Dybwad. Each 1 Kr. 60.
- Piöriks Saga af Bern. Udgivet for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved H. Bertelsen. 6. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 Kr.
- UDDGREN, G., A. Strindberg. Början till en biografi. Göteborg, Aahlén och Aakerlund. 1 Kr.

Dutch.

- DIEDERIC VAN ASSENEDE, *Floris ende Blancefloer.* Uitgeg. door P. Leendertz Jr. (Bibliotheek van middelnederlandsche letterkunde.) 2 vols. Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff. 4 fl. 50.

English.

(a) General.

- BJÖRKMAN, E., *Zur englischen Namenkunde.* (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XLVII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.
- BLADIN, V., *Studies on Denominative Verbs in English.* Dissertation. Upsala.

KOSZUL, A., Anthologie de la littérature anglaise. Tome I. Des origines au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. 5 fr.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

BOER, R. C., Die altenglische Heldendichtung. I. Bëowulf. (Germanistische Handbibliothek, XI.) Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 5 M.

GREIN, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter. Unter Mitwirkung von F. Holzhausen neu herausgegeben von J. J. Köhler. (Sammlung germanistischen Elementar- und Handbücher, IV. Wörterbücher, IV. Band.) 3. und 4. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 1 M. 50.

PIERQUIN, H., Le poëme anglo-saxon de Beowulf. Paris, Picard. 15 fr.

(c) *Modern English.*

BEAUMONT, F., and FLETCHER, J. Works. Vol. x. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge, University Press. 4s. 6d. net.

BROWN, M. J., Historical ballad poetry of Ireland, ed. by. London, Longmans. 3s. 6d.

BROWNING, R., Works. Introduction by Sir F. Kenyon. Vol. III. London, Smith, Elder. 10s. 6d. net.

CANNING, A. S. G., Dickens studied in six Novels. London, Fisher Unwin. 6s. net.

CORY, H. E., Spenser, the School of the Fletchers, and Milton. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, II, 5.) Berkeley, Univ. of California Press.

COWPER, W., Letters. Chosen and edited, with a Memoir and a few Notes, by J. G. Frazer. 2 vols. (Eversley Series.) London, Macmillan. 8s. net.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Sidney Lee. Second Supplement. Vol. I. Abbey—Eyre. London, Smith, Elder. 15s. net.

FITZGERALD, P., Jane Austen: a Criticism and Appreciation. London, Jarrold. 3s. 6d. net.

KADO, M., Swinburne's Verskunst. (Normannia, IX.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M.

KENNEDY, J. M., English Literature, 1880–1905. London, S. Swift. 7s. 6d. net.

Maistre d'escole Anglois, Le. Von J. B. Gen. Ca. (1580). Herausgegeben von Th. Spira. (Frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, VII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 60.

MALORY, Selections from. Chosen and edited by H. Wragg. London, Frowde. 2s.

McAFEE, C. B., The Greatest English Classic: a Study of the King James Version of the Bible and its Influence on Life and Literature. London, Harper. 5s. net.

MEYER-FRANCK, H., Robert Browning, 'The Ring and the Book.' Eine Interpretation. Göttingen, O. Hapke. 2 M. 80.

MOLL, O. E. E., Der Stil von Byron's Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. (Normannia, X.) Berlin, E. Felber. 2 M. 50.

REUNING, K., Das Altertümliche im Wortschatz der Spenser-Nachahmungen des 18. Jahrh. (Quellen und Forschungen, CXVI.) Strassburg, Trübner. 6 M. 25.

SAINTSBURY, G. A History of English Prose Rhythm. London, Macmillan. 14s.

SCHULZ, E., Die englischen Schwankbücher bis herab zu 'Dobson's drie bobs' (1607). (Palaestra, CXVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.

- SHAKESPEARE, W., *The Life of Henry V.* Edited by F. J. Furnivall. (Old-spelling Shakespeare.) London, Chatto and Windus. 2s. 6d. net.
- Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, *Jahrbuch der deutschen.* XLVIII. Jahrgang. Berlin-Schöneberg, Langenscheidt. 11 M.
- SINCLAIR, M., *The Three Brontës.* London, Hutchinson. 6s. net.
- SIXTUS, J., *Der Sprachgebrauch des Dialekt-Schriftstellers Frank Robinson zu Bowness in Westmoreland.* (Palaestra, cxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.
- SUDDARD, S. J. M., *Essais de littérature anglaise.* Cambridge, University Press. 5s. net.
- SUDDARD, S. J. M., *Keats, Shelley and Shakespeare: Studies and Essays in English Literature.* Cambridge, University Press. 6s. net.
- TAYLOR, H. V., *Letters of Great Writers, from the time of Spenser to the time of Wordsworth, edited by.* London, Blackie. 4s. 6d. net.
- WALTERS, J. S., *Mrs Humphry Ward: her work and influence.* London, Kegan Paul. 3s. 6d. net.
- WILLOUGHBY, L. A., *Dante Gabriel Rossetti and German Literature.* A public Lecture. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. net.

German.

(a) *General.*

- BEHN, S., *Der deutsche Rhythmus und sein eigenes Gesetz. Eine experimentelle Untersuchung.* Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 6 M. 50.
- KLUGE, F., *Wortforschung und Wortgeschichte. Aufsätze zum deutschen Sprachschatz.* Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 3 M. 60.

(b) *Old and Middle High German.*

- FÖRSTEMANN, E., *Altdeutsches Namenbuch, II.* 3te Auflage von H. Jellinghaus. 2.—4. Lieferung. Bonn, Hanstein. Each 5 M.
- HARTMANN VON AUE, *Der arme Heinrich.* Herausgegeben von H. Paul. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, III.) 5. Auflage. Halle, Niemeyer. 50 pf.
- KONRAD VON WÜRZBURG, Engelhard. Herausgegeben von P. Gereke. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, XVII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.
- Mittelhochdeutsche Novellen.* I. Die Heidin. II. Rittertreue. Schlegel. Herausgegeben von L. Pfannmüller. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, XCII, xcv.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 20 and 1 M. 50.
- Oswald, *Der Wiener.* Herausgegeben von G. Baesecke. (Germanische Bibliothek, III. Abt., Kritische Ausgaben altdeutscher Texte, II.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M. 20.

(c) *Modern German.*

- BERENDSOHN, W. A., *Stil und Form der Aphorismen Lichtenbergs.* Kiel, W. G. Mühlaus. 3 M. 50.
- BIEBER, H., J. A. Schlegels poetische Theorie; in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange untersucht. (Palaestra, cxiv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M. 50.
- BRENTANO, C., *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz.* Unter erstmaliger Benutzung des gesamten handschriftlichen Materials, herausgegeben und eingeleitet von A. M. von Steinle. Trier, Petrus-Verlag. 5 M. 50.
- BURCHINAL, M. C., *Hans Sachs and Goethe. A Study in Meter.* (Hesperia, II.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 M. 80.
- FRANK, E., *Rezensionen über schöne Literatur von Schelling und Caroline in der neuen jenaischen Literatur-Zeitung.* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

- FREILIGRATH, F., Werke. Herausgegeben von P. Zaunert. 2 Bände. (Meyers Klassiker-Ausgabe.) Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 4 M.
- GADIANT, P. V., Prokop von Templin. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, III.) Regensburg, J. Habel. 6 M.
- Goethe-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von L. Geiger. XXXIII. Band. Frankfurt o. M., Literarische Anstalt. 10 M.
- KÖRNCHEN, H., Zesens Romane. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romans im 17. Jahrhundert. (Palaestra, cxv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 80.
- KÜHNEMANN, E., Herder. 2^{te} neu bearbeitete Auflage. Munich, C. H. Beck. 8 M.
- LEITZMANN, A., Die Quellen von Schillers Wilhelm Tell. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, xc.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 20.
- LENAU, N., Sämtliche Werke und Briefe. Herausgegeben von E. Castle. IV. Band (Briefe, II.). Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.
- LUTHER, M., Sämtliche deutsche geistliche Lieder. In der Reihenfolge ihrer ersten Drucke herausgegeben von F. Klippgen. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrh., ccxxx.) Halle, Niemeyer. 60 pf.
- PORT, F., Hermann Lingg. Eine Lebensgeschichte. Munich, C. H. Beck. 4 M. 50.
- ROSALEWSKI, W., Schillers Ästhetik im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.
- SCHAAFFS, G., Goethes Hero und Leander und Schillers romantisches Gedicht. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 4 M. 50.
- SCHAAFFS, G., Goethes Schatzgräber und die Weissagungen des Bakis. Leipzig, A. Weigel. 5 M.
- SCHADE, O., Faust. Vom Ursprung bis zur Verklärung durch Goethe. Herausgegeben von R. Schade. Berlin, K. Curtius. 7 M. 50.
- SCHILLER, J. F., Anthologie-Gedichte. Herausgegeben von W. Stammeler. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, xciii.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 50.
- SCHINDLER, K., Die Technik des Aktschlusses im neueren deutschen Drama mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des 18. Jahrh. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 40.
- SCHURIG, A., Der junge Heinse. Munich, G. Müller. 2 M. 50
- STRAUSS, B., Der Übersetzer Nicolaus von Wyle. (Palaestra, cxviii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 80.
- TODT, W., Lessing in England, 1767–1850. (Anglistische Arbeiten, I.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 80.
- VULLIOD, A., P. Rosegger. L'Homme et l'œuvre. (Bibliothèque de philologie et de littérature modernes.) Paris, F. Alcan. 10 fr.
- WODICK, W., J. Ayrsers Dramen in ihrem Verhältnis zur einheimischen Literatur und zum Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.
- ZÜRCHER, O., Jens Baggesens Parthenais. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, XI.) Leipzig, H. Haessel. 3 M.

